

Faculty Senate Minutes
Monday, April 21, 2014
McCormick Room, Collins Library

Senators present: Nila Wiese, Haley Andres, Derek Buescher, Andrea Kueter, Cynthia Gibson, Andrew Gardner, Leslie Saucedo, Kriszta Kotsis, Amanda Mifflin, Alisa Kessel, Ariela Tubert, Jonathan Stockdale, Kris Bartanen, Paige Maney.

Guests present: Denise Despres, Jennifer Hastings, Karl Fields, Alexa Tullis

Senator Kessel (acting Chair) called the meeting to order at 4:02 pm.

Approval of minutes

There was a question about the accuracy of the statement that “someone in the minority vote may ask for a proposal to be reconsidered.” Haltom will be contacted to verify whether a minority voter or any member may ask for a reconsideration of a proposal.

The minutes of 4-7-14 were approved with minor changes.

Announcements

Welcome of new ASUPS president Paige Maney.

Wiese announced that 54% of the faculty has voted on the primary elections. A reminder will go out on 4/22. Wiese asked that the senators encourage colleagues to vote.

Year-end Report of the Library, Media, and Information Systems Committee (LMIS)

Denise Despres presented the year-end report for the LMIS committee. The full report is attached as Appendix A. Overall the committee felt they had met all of their charges. Most of their conversations were dominated by PeopleSoft and Optimize, putting important issues on the back burner. The committee is hopeful that next year they will be able to spend more time on library issues.

Issues that LMIS would like Senate to think about for next year:

- There are increasing numbers of students working in archives and spilling out into library space. The committee would like direction on how they could reconstruct space to be less disruptive. A request in the report especially prepared on this initiative was not funded, and they seek input on how to continue to advocate for this space. The committee would like to have a better sense of whether the time spent researching an issue and creating a report or proposal actually makes a difference in the budget, so that they know whether the committee’s work will result in tangible outcomes.
- Collins library looks outdated, and there is a need for sustained exploration of updating library spaces.

Saucedo wondered about the workload of the charges proposed for the next academic year. Despres noted that the first few charges are not really LMIS directives (electronic instructor/course evaluation files, for example), and that may be better placed under a different committee's purview. Despres added that LMIS would be involved in implementation of electronic evaluation files but that the policy work was being handled by the PSC.

Saucedo asked about the Turn-It-In alarms—are these results public to other members of the University? She was concerned about privacy issues. Despres responded that they are kept confidential, but have to keep records to figure out if the software is paying for itself. A larger percentage of faculty need to use it to make it cost-effective.

Buescher asked if the digital archives charge was beyond the scope of LMIS. Despres responded that no, it wasn't. However, digitalizing archives is a large, expensive undertaking. LMIS can make recommendations, but implementation will take funding. In terms of continuing it as a charge for next year, LMIS doesn't think they will have time for it until they have funding for it and the implementation of Optimize is complete.

Sampen asked if the conversation should be postponed until funding is appropriated. Despres said she would defer to Jane Carlin on this. The charge is in the spirit of what LMIS should be doing. Sampen asked what the senators could do to help this project move forward. Bartanen replied that the next place to bring it forth would be as a Budget Task Force charge. There just weren't dollars this year to do it. The senate could also affirm the importance of this project. Despres added that it is the one teaching related issue LMIS dealt with, and it would be a pity if it did not go anywhere. She added that it was time that humanities had something like this, as many resources have been allocated to the sciences for the past few years, but not to upgrading teaching spaces for the humanities. Puget Sound is falling behind in this area as compared to our peer institutions. LMIS feels strongly about it and would like to move forward, and it would be great to have the support of the senate.

Wiese added that she can understand the frustration of doing all the work and then finding out there is no money to implement. She urged the senate to take this concern into consideration when assigning committee charges next year.

Kessel asked about the Print Green page limit range, and wondered whether having information of printing usage by department may allow us to adjust the limits to Print Green to meet these needs. Despres indicated that the data they examine is not disaggregated by department.

M (Buescher)/S (Wiese)/P to receive this report.

Year-end Report of the Professional Standards Committee (PSC)

Jennifer Hastings presented the year-end report for the PSC. The full report is attached in Appendix B. The PSC would like to see the creation of an ad hoc committee to pursue

rewriting of the faculty code around evaluation criteria. They suggest that members of the FAC as well as the PSC be recruited for this ad-hoc committee.

Wiese asked whether charges 5 and 6 were implemented. Hastings responded that the ability to submit files electronically via Moodle is finished. There will be a link from the buff document. There was discussion on whether LMIS concerns had been addressed (anonymity, etc.). Faculty evaluation files in a Moodle shell can be supported as per Cindy Riche. Electronic course and instructor evaluations have not been implemented as they are a bit of a Pandora's box. The concerns are not with the collection of data, but with potential student collusion, when evaluations will be administered, etc.

Regarding background checks, Kotsis asked if Facebook background checks ever came up. Hastings responded that just education checks are currently implemented, not check through social media.

Stockdale inquired about the recommended charge #2 for next year ("Review all of the PSC interpretations of the Faculty Code to see if any have become obsolete by more recent interpretations and to ensure consistency of all interpretations with current practice and policies on campus")— what does this mean? The PSC wants to take the time to look through the code and PSC code interpretations to see if there are other inconsistencies that need to be addressed.

Saucedo asked if the streamlining of faculty evaluations would affect the current rules for class visitations. Hastings indicated that class visitations may be part of the information that needs to be gathered in performing a streamlined review.

Sampen requested a clarification on the meaning of "streamline of review unless requested." Who would be able to make the request? Bartanen responded that the faculty member, head officer or dean can make the request. Bartanen clarified that all of the proposed changes to the evaluation process would have to go to the Faculty for approval prior to any implementation.

Tubert inquired about the issues with electronic implementation of course evaluations. Hastings responded that the issues with implementation are more about whether we still wanted to collect them in 20 minutes inside the classroom, laptop/wireless issues. We first need to determine what is broken in the current system. Is it the time and energy of administrative assistants? Paper use? Aggregation of data? We are not sure what the main problems are—it would be helpful to have specific charges for next year to survey the faculty and give presentations of data at faculty meeting. The additional information would help the PSC in the development of policies.

Bartanen asked for clarification on whether the evaluation schedule recommendation would involve an ad hoc committee, and the answer was yes.

One specific concern of the PSC is that the work of PSC is significantly interfered with when there are one-semester participants (e.g., due sabbaticals, etc.). A lot of reconsideration is necessary when that happens and it would be preferable to limit changes to the PSC's membership throughout the year.

M(Wiese)/S/P to accept this report.

Year-end Report of the Academic Standards Committee (ASC)

Karl Fields presented the year-end report of the ASC. The full report is attached in Appendix C.

Most discussion centered on the issue of transfer credits. The agreement is that the Running Start policy is not broken, but it could be better communicated to students. The student impression from online information and college recruiters is often different from reality. Puget Sound is more rigorous than other institutions in terms of accepting transfer credit. The ASC does not feel that we are turning away students we want to come to Puget Sound with our current policy, but we need to do a better job of communicating the policy. The ASC just started the discussion of transferring credit beyond the 16-credit limit and feels that the conversation should continue next year. Proposed charge #3 will be split into two separate charges: 1) a review of the 16-unit transfer and 2) a review of the re-articulation of current policy.

Saucedo asked about logistics of streamlining petitions for “ordinary” issues—how do we know what the subcommittee would approve if the members change every few years? Should we have faculty come in every few years to agree on what an ordinary issue is? Fields responded that the ASC would take the direction of the Senate on that issue. The full committee does get briefed on these decisions, so it is not completely detached from the larger body.

M (Saucedo)/S/P to accept the report with minor revisions.

Year-end Report of the Faculty Advancement Committee (FAC)

Alexa Tullis presented the year-end report of the FAC. The full report is attached as Appendix D. The Senate commended members of the FAC for their service. A particular thank you was extended to Tullis for agreeing to continue on next semester to help with continuity for new members.

Tubert asked what kind of reasoning there was for supporting electronic instructor/course evaluation forms. Tullis responded that scanned paper forms would work for the FAC from a sustainability perspective. It would also be easier (for professors or the University, not necessarily FAC) to analyze the data. Bartanen added that she has seen a lot of faculty spending time creating these tables of data for evaluation files, which could easily be done by computer. Sampen expressed concern that aggregating the evaluation data might be undesirable for various reasons (i.e., an anomalous semester with a bad classroom dynamic, etc.). Mifflin suggested that the data is in the evaluations regardless, so it should not matter whether the numbers were aggregated or not. If the numbers are not being

analyzed, then perhaps we should have an evaluation without a numerical score section. Buescher indicated that the form/presentation of data is different when it is aggregated.

Saucedo asked whose fault it is if there are not enough class visits by colleagues. That situation can put an evaluatee in a difficult position. It was suggested that a chart of visits established at the start of an evaluation period might be helpful in reminding the head officer to encourage visits.

There was a question of whether the department or university code was used as the guideline for visits (some departments have different standards for evaluation than the university code). Tullis responded that the FAC looks at departmental guidelines.

Tubert mentioned that she found that reading full evaluation materials on Moodle is sometimes time-consuming due to having to open each individual file. Tullis responded that the FAC appreciates the flexibility of being able to access files electronically, rather than sharing binders. It is also helpful to be able to view electronic course materials.

Stockdale asked if the FAC was still planning to tackle the Faculty Research Award this year. If not, would that get sent back as a charge for next year? After all of the faculty reviews are completed, and if time allows, the FAC will review the selection criteria for the award.

M (Saucedo)/S/P to accept the report.

Other business

None.

The Faculty Senate adjourned at 5:32 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Amanda Mifflin

To: Faculty Senate
From: Denise Despres, Chairperson LMIS
Concerning: Report LMIS Charges 2013-14
Date: April 13, 2014

Dear Colleagues: The following is a summary of our responses to the Faculty Senate Charges. For your convenience, I have supplied appropriate websites for further information and encourage you to consult the LMIS minutes posted on SoundNet. For your convenience, I will simply address the issues by charges:

1.

Provide input and guidance to the Library during implementation of the new integrated library system (ILS). The Shared Integrated Library System, set to go live in June 2014, will link Collins Library to eighteen other libraries that have already migrated, with all 37 libraries allied by January 2015. Some information about the shared system has already been disseminated in the *Technology Services Newsletter* (to Chairs), and to the campus community via email, but future recommendations include a LibGuide that provides further details about the project and answers FAQs; an email to the campus community via Open Line; and ongoing communication through email, drop-in times, and social media. The LMIS Committee has received periodic updates from Jane Carlin, Library Director and Wade Guidry, Library Systems Administrator. LMIS Committee has provided advice for communicating with faculty about this project. An all campus email and guide to the project has been distributed. Once the public interface is available, LMIS will be involved in providing some general feedback. Carlin informed the committee that the new library search platform will be rolled out in June, 2014, but fortunately, it can be tested beforehand. Carlin asked whether members of the committee would be willing to participate in the testing of Primo (the name of the program) before the rollout in June. Committee members agreed to participate in testing. **Assessment and testing will be completed over the summer and we anticipate that the Committee will continue to operate in an advisory capacity in the fall.**

In addition to updating us on this new system, Jane Carlin presented the LMIS with a report from a workshop that she attended at the University of Washington in Seattle. The workshop was convened by the Association of Research Libraries and was attended by roughly 30 people. Puget Sound was the only liberal arts college represented at the workshop. The purpose of the workshop was to brainstorm, share success stories, and discuss issues affecting research libraries in the United States.

One issue that was identified and discussed was the ‘competency trap,’ which occurs when organizations continue to use methods or approaches that worked in the past, but that may not be optimal or innovative. In the context of research libraries, the competency trap may lull universities into making only incremental changes rather than thinking ‘outside the box.’ Carlin stated that the moral of the story is that libraries should not get trapped into simply doing what has worked in the past.

Participants at the workshop identified three possible roles for libraries in the future, in light of the ways in which open access has revolutionized research, especially in the sciences, the need to provide access to information that is free of commercial messages and the switch to digital

information: first, the library as a means of creating new information access (Carlin mentioned the Cascade Alliance, which features 37 participating libraries); second, the library as a third space, away from home and work, where collaboration, exploration, discovery, and engagement can occur; and third, the library as archive, whereby digital information and cultural knowledge can be recorded, presented, and stored.

The LMIS should continue to monitor and discuss the problem of the “competency trap” that faces the Collins Library, despite significant innovations. In particular, LMIS needs to revisit the use of space in ways that reflect contemporary library functionality, including teaching spaces, collaborative student learning spaces, small group faculty collaborative learning spaces, and hands-on, interdisciplinary project spaces.

2.

Review new technologies and their potential infringement upon student privacy. Recommend ways to improve faculty familiarity with FERPA and to encourage use of the resources available on campus to assist them with compliance.

LMIS asked Cindy Riche and William Morse to update the committee on this issue and the way new technology on campus will impact FERPA. William has explained that, prior to our switch to PeopleSoft, we relied on Cascade, which is a transactional program that allowed for very little reporting or analysis. One of the advantages of PeopleSoft is that it can create a data warehouse, or as it is popularly known “big data.” In the near future, the University will be able to compile data on particular questions, and although the notion of the data can be daunting for some, we will be able to add data from Moodle or Admissions or external records and add this data to data being created in PeopleSoft. On the issue of privacy, Morse stated that much of the data produced by PeopleSoft is anonymous, and in those cases where data is not anonymous, access is limited to those who have access through PeopleSoft in the first place. The Office of Institutional Research will have access to, and manage, the data being compiled through PeopleSoft. Again, Morse and Riche stressed that access to the data warehouse will be limited to those who are given access through the PeopleSoft security systems, and therefore, access to the data being generated through PeopleSoft will not be open to the general public.

Morse indicated that the data warehouse has not been built yet, but will start soon with Admissions information (for example, data that is used to show which students are likely to enroll in Puget Sound, so that recruitment efforts can be targeted to those students). Another advantage of the data warehouse that will be created through PeopleSoft is that discrepancies across the University in definitions and data categories will be identified, which will allow better synchronization across different offices in the University.

LMIS has also discussed the second part of the charge listed above, namely “ways to improve faculty familiarity with FERPA and to encourage use of the resources available on campus to assist them with compliance.” Riche pointed out that FERPA is “owned” by the Academic Dean. There are many ways to violate FERPA, and FERPA is mentioned in many places on the university website, including but not limited to, the following sites:

- FERPA Tutorial: <http://www.pugetsound.edu/academics/advising-registrar/know-educational-rights/ferpa-tutorial/>
- <http://www.pugetsound.edu/academics/advising-registrar/resources/advisors-manual/first-year-advising-program/educational-records-policy/>
- <http://www.pugetsound.edu/academics/advising-registrar/resources/advisors-manual/academic-advising/records-confidentiality/>
- <http://www.pugetsound.edu/academics/advising-registrar/know-educational-rights/>
- <http://www.pugetsound.edu/academics/international-programs/study-abroad/parents/ferpa/>
- <http://www.pugetsound.edu/student-life/personal-safety/student-handbook/academic-handbook/records/>
- As it pertains to cloud services: <http://www.pugetsound.edu/about/offices-services/technology-services/help-support/using-cloud-services/>

Riche stated, and other committee members agreed, that some faculty are not aware at all of FERPA or that there are many actions that would violate FERPA (for example, leaving examinations out on a table outside a faculty member’s office for collection by students). Riche has asked LMIS about the best way to spread the word to faculty about FERPA. LMIS suggested that a brief presentation be made at a future faculty meeting informing faculty of ways in which to avoid violating FERPA requirements. Several members of the committee also suggested that a bullet point list of FERPA “dos and don’ts” be sent to faculty through campus mail. **Finally, we may be able to use the new PeopleSoft portal under design to spread FERPA information to faculty.**

3.

Develop a preservation strategy for digital archives in order to preserve the electronic history of the university.

Due to complex nature of the issue and the pending library implementation and the continuation of the Optimize Project, this initiative has not been actively addressed this academic year. Katie Henningsen, Archivist and Digital Collections Coordinator, did attend a digital archives course offered by the Society of American Archives and the Association of Research Libraries in late December. The course covered the following topics: digital curation, digital archives, and preservation of digital archives. This will provide a foundation for further discussions in the next academic year. **Both William Morse and Jane Carlin stress that this is a huge and complex topic that requires funding and university support.**

4.

Continue to monitor the implementation of Optimize, solicit feedback on areas for system improvement, and keep the Faculty Senate informed about progress.

The majority of our LMIS meetings were occupied with this issue this past academic year. Optimize Puget Sound, the university’s initial implementation of PeopleSoft, has focused over the past two years on getting the core pillars of the system in place. We are now in the next phase of the project, dubbed Maximize Puget Sound, which is focused on improving or adding

needed functionality. The Project Management Office section of the Technology Services website (pugetsound.edu/pmo) details these ongoing efforts, including the recent implementation of new tools such as printer-friendly class rosters, enhanced functionality to return all sections when searching for classes, and the new My Advisees Hub where advisors can see advisee information (major, minor, GPA, etc.) in one place.

More improvements are to come, including added features in My Advisees Hub, a page for chairs and administrative assistants to see all students in a department, student alerts and person information, preferred name on self-service pages (including class search), improved waitlist swap functionality for registration, a university transcript based on the model previously available in Cascade, and the ability for students to change major/minor and select advisor. The rollout in the fall of the new portal, myPugetSound, will help greatly with the usability of PeopleSoft as it will streamline access to common applications and require sign-in only once. Users will also have the ability to group together commonly-used items on a personalized page. Technology Services continues to ask for faculty input and CIO William Morse and Travis Nation, Deputy CIO and project manager of the PeopleSoft implementation, are available to meet with departments and offices or with faculty and staff individually.

The [Project Management Office](#) section of the Technology Services website details all ongoing efforts to improve or add needed functions. The Implementing Officers understand that usability in the new system is currently less than ideal. Often several clicks are required to do simple tasks, and moving between the core pillars of the system (Campus Solutions, Financials, and Human Resources) requires multiple sign-ins. The rollout in the fall of **myPugetSound**, our new portal, will greatly help with this issue, as it will streamline access to common applications and require users to sign in only once. Users will also have the ability to group together those items most used in on a personalized page.

For information on the selection process that occurred for PeopleSoft, see the [ERP Selection Archive](#) on the Technology Services website.

5.

Continue to support initiatives to raise awareness and use of Archives and Special Collections, building on the 2012-2013 LMIS Committee report.

The Library staff has done an excellent job of developing a new lecture series entitled “Behind the Archives Door.” Information about this series is distributed to faculty via email and posters as well as one on one invitations. In addition, many faculty have been working directly with Katie Henningsen to integrate primary source materials within their classes. As part of the LMIS committee’s charge “to continue to support initiatives to raise awareness and use of archives and special collections”, Peggy Burge, Humanities Liaison Librarian, and Katie Henningsen, Archivist and Digital Collections Coordinator, were asked to provide the committee with an update on student research skills, use of the Archives and Special Collections, and to discuss possible changes to the existing space to facilitate library activities, humanities classes, and curricular development.

Peggy Burge discussed student literacy with regards to discerning the differences between various kinds of source materials (scholarly, popular, primary and secondary sources) as well as the results of the research practices survey. The survey indicated that, although student research skills were improving, there is still work to be done in helping students to recognize and utilize different materials appropriately and effectively in their studies. Katie Henningsen noted that, since the beginning of the fall 2013 semester, 220 students have worked in the archives and special collections as either part of a class or on their own initiative. Henningsen also discussed the kinds of research skills and strategies and opportunities afforded by working with primary source materials. Both archivist Henningsen and LMIS member Amy Fisher, who frequently uses the archives in teaching her STS courses, have expressed concerns with the existing teaching space for the archives and special collections. Because of the number and size of classes taking advantage of archival materials, many classes spill out of the Shelmidine room into the hallway, creating conservation challenges as well as disruptions for other library patrons.

Henningsen also discussed initiatives to make faculty and students more aware of the variety of resources available in the archives and special collections. *Behind the Archives' Door*, a bi-monthly public lecture series, features the work of faculty and students in the collections. Also, there are a number of student workers in the archives and special collections, providing valuable work-study opportunities for students. Again, she noted that the existing space does not make it easy to facilitate the number of researchers and students interested in working with the collections.

Last spring, Jane Carlin and Katie Henningsen along with members of 2012-2013 LMIS Committee and other faculty undertook an evaluation of the existing space. In conjunction with the group's recommendations, Henningsen reported that some of 2nd floor secondary source materials and shelving had been shifted to other parts of the library to make a larger and brighter space with more seating for use by the archives. This area, however, is outside of the formal special collections space and open to all library patrons. It had been recommended last spring that glass walls be installed to partition the space from the general stacks, to create more privacy, reduce noise, and to provide more protection for rare books and artifacts. A proposal was drafted, asking for funding to renovate the space. Because of other construction projects on campus, the archival renovation project was placed in hiatus. LMIS will continue to advocate for developing Archives space.

Unfortunately, despite an excellent foundational report that outlined opportunities for enhanced space for the Archives & Special Collections, we were unable to move ahead with any defined action steps associated with the project. Email correspondence with Sherry Mondou and Bob Kief indicated that there was no funding at the time and that the library project was not part of the building improvement programs underway. Despite this set back, the library staff should be commended for their ability to create a more open space for teaching upstairs with the removal of shelving, addition of seating and display of engaging graphics. In addition, the Shelmidine Room was reconfigured to serve as a classroom.

The LMIS Committee seeks input from the faculty senate on how we might continue to advocate for this important space that will support teaching and learning and enhance the

educational experience for Puget Sound students. Specifically, the LMIS committee needs a clear sense of whether or not its recommendations have any influence on implementation when the projects require even modest funding.

7.

In collaboration with librarians explore issues related to new publishing as they apply to Puget Sound and suggest ways to provide faculty with guidance on fair use, intellectual property rights, and management of their creative works.

Ben Tucker, Business and Economics Librarian, provided an overview of Sound Ideas as well as created a short guide to this resource for faculty. Jane Carlin reminded LMIS that each fall the Library sends copyright compliance and author's rights information to faculty. In addition, all faculty were sent author's rights negotiation packets 2 years ago. The LMIS Committee recommends an update be scheduled for faculty in fall of 2014.

8.

Collaborate with the Library to develop a prominent display for recent faculty scholarship in the library (or other campus venues).

The Library current uses digital screens to showcase faculty authors through a program titled: Find Faculty Authors in Collins. The screen uses an image of the publication with call number of location. This program is updated on a semester basis. In May, The Library always organizes an exhibit of recently published items. A permanent display is difficult to maintain and only reflects printed books. This does not adequately reflect the diversity of faculty achievements such as electronic publications, art exhibitions, performances, and other digital/media related academic achievements. There is also physical display of faculty works and the Faculty Scholarship publication at the front of the Library. The Library purchases new faculty publications as soon as they find out about them but not all faculty or departments routinely share that information. In addition, the physical displays are not adequate for highlighting "the diversity of faculty achievements such as electronic publications, art exhibitions, performances, and other digital/media related academic achievements." This last has been partially addressed by having links to new materials in *Sound Ideas*. Suggestions from the ensuing discussion include: rethink the display locations, have a monthly spotlight highlighting recent works, announce the displays on the new University website with a link to the actual work, find a way to obtain a complete list of items in a timely fashion, invite faculty to talk about their work – perhaps with a radio show, share pertinent department links, perhaps on a rotating basis, on the University website and look into having a systematic collection of Curricula Vitae.. **Due to the complexity of the Library Implementation Project no additional action was taken on this topic for this academic year.**

"Sound Ideas" is an institutional repository of scholarly and creative work by both students and faculty. At present, there are 3910 total records (1100 from faculty), with 150,000 downloads so far. Among other things, "Sound Ideas" is designed to promote Puget Sound scholarship, support open access to scholarly information, and increase awareness of student research. LMIS had a presentation on Sound Ideas by Ben Tucker, who confirmed the success of this mission with examples of the most popular faculty and student records, with the number of downloads for each ranging between 100-400 so far. Ben finished his presentation by fielding questions about

related copyright issues, which may concern faculty who want to provide access to records already published in pay-subscription journals, or graduate students who might wish to publish material that had been open access on our site.

9.

Collaborate with the PSC to assess the viability of using electronically-administered Instructor and Course Evaluation Forms. LMIS discussed the possibility of replacing current paper course evaluations with an online system of gathering responses. William Morse introduced the discussion by asserting this was a policy matter rather than a media issue, before sharing from his experience at previous institutions that made a similar move. Accepting the significant savings of cost and time made possible by switching to electronic evaluations, the group raised questions regarding incentive and collection (how do we get students to respond? would they do these in class time dedicated to this purpose, or outside of class at their own convenience? if in class, what devices and bandwidth would need to be available?); quality of evaluations (are our communications substantively different online or with a smartphone than with pen and paper? similarly, if these evaluations would occur outside of class, what might be the effect of environmental contexts, such as writing an evaluation while with classmates who are sharing their opinions about an instructor or course?). Many of these issues need to be discussed by the PSC and then presented to the faculty formally before LMIS can move ahead with any kind of implementation. **LMIS redirected this issue to the PSC and sees implementation of it as the purview of the LMIS.**

10.

Work with the PSC to assess the viability of a process for electronic submission of faculty evaluation files. Despres consulted with the Professional Standards Committee and it is the PSC who are charged to “assess the viability” in Charges #9 and #10. If these are deemed viable, the Faculty Senate may charge LMIS with addressing implementation. Cindy Rich has already been consulted on using Moodle for faculty evaluations but argues that significant programming by IT would be necessary to have Moodle meet anonymity and other requirements. She also noted we are in contact with some schools that have implemented Moodle in this fashion. Both Riche and Morse noted that pilot programs are not obvious first steps since they essentially require developing the full infrastructure. Morse reminded us that policy should be decided first, followed by a determination of specific needs/requirements, and then beginning actual implementation.

11.

Assess the possibility of eliminating due dates for non-Summit library materials checked out to faculty. The Library purchases materials that are available for the entire user population of Puget Sound. Faculty have six month checkouts and we are part of a consortium that supports the concept of sharing. The LMIS Committee supports the current policy.

12.

Consider raising the page limit in Print Green for students in graduate programs. Our current print system offers no way to separate out and analyze printing by status of the student. It would take significant programming time to be able to pull out and compare the printing of graduate vs. undergrad, or different majors to other majors. This programming time would require additional funding and will not be possible to even start for 18 -24 months, given other priorities for our programmers and TS staff. Ultimately, providing differential allotments based on student status is not possible given current resources. Additional resources would need to be provided to do this (via BTF or other budget process).

LMIS took into account the needs of classes with higher printing requirements by providing a very high print allotment to our students for each semester with the full knowledge that many will not use their entire allotment. Printing costs are due to paper and print use (and printer wear and tear). If 100 students don't use their full allotments, that money isn't "saved" so that it can be reallocated... it was never spent to begin with. In essence, we "overbooked" the printers, knowing that only a certain % of users would "show up" on a continual basis. And, the allotment is incredibly generous to cover the vast majority of our users' needs. William Morse has explained that because implementing different quotas for different groups of students was difficult and costly to implement, it was decided when the Print Green initiative went into effect that a blanket quota would be applied instead (he also indicated that Puget Sound's quota was generous compared to many other institutions). Morse informed the committee that Puget Sound students print 350 pages per semester, which is far below the 750 quota allocated each semester to all students. The committee recommended that due to cost of implementation, as well as equity in the campus community, that the page limit should remain the same for all students. One reason for this recommendation, aside from the cost and technical difficulty of applying different quotas, is that students would resent it if some groups were given higher printing quotas. However, after hearing about possible options for the printing of course materials, including on-demand printing of course packs, from Riche, the committee recommended that Riche and the other members of the Educational Technology team consult with particular programs on possible ways to reduce printing costs for students

13.

Recommend ways to educate the faculty about TurnItIn and devise methods for facilitating faculty use.

So far, 52 instructors and 1129 students have used TurnItIn. There have been 2000 submissions with 260 of those making use of Grade Mark and 88 being graded on-line. Of the 2000 submissions, TurnItIn generate 93 alarms but 87 of those were associated with a science lab where it is plausible that there would be many common phrases used by the students. Carlin asked if the data could be filtered by department and Riche is looking into it. Carlin also noted there are broader issues associated with plagiarism that LMIS can address while looking at TurnItIn. The LMIS discussion has addressed: why are faculty being encouraged to use TurnItIn (because it is paid for), why use it if faculty have personalized methods for ensuring similar papers cannot be found on-line or for recognizing individual student's writing "signatures" (yet, without also using TurnItIn we don't know if that process is successful), and are there other useful ways to use it (it can be the backbone of an in-class lesson on plagiarism).

The committee agreed that workshops, perhaps during the semester and at Faculty Orientation, would be a good way to increase faculty awareness of TurnItIn and its capabilities. This would give faculty hands-on experience, provide a venue for highlighting current user's methods of practice, and illustrate how TurnItIn can be used to give students a more precise understanding of what is and is not plagiarism. It would also be a good topic for a Wednesday at 4:00 discussion. Cindy Riche volunteered to meet with Carlin and Lori Ricigliano about getting workshops on appropriate agendas.

Other possible charges or LMIS projects:

- 1) William Morse suggested that LMIS study student experiential learning portfolios, a repository of all student work collected in one repository over four years to be used for internships, job interviews. Etc. Currently, Moodle provides this option with a program entitled Mahara.
- 2) William Morse also expressed an interest in pursuing the option of cocurricular transcripts to maintain student and University records of the myriad activities (cultural, community service, etc.) for which we currently have no means to record.
- 3) Opportunities for LMIS to participate in the University's collaboration with the NW5.

Year end report of the PSC (2013-2014)

Members: William Barry, Geoffrey Block, Douglas Cannon (spring only). Jennifer Hastings (chair), Tiffany MacBain, Andreas Madlung (fall only), Mark Reinitz, Kurt Walls and Kris Bartanen (ex-officio)

Prior to receiving our charges for the year the PSC acted on the following matters:

1. Answered an inquiry from a department chair regarding evaluation procedures (September 18th) PSC affirmed the interpretation of “role of colleagues”.
2. Answered inquiry from a Chair regarding the appropriate level participation in a departmental search for a faculty member who was in a relationship of a consensual sexual nature with an applicant —PSC endorsed full recusal (October 9th and clarified November 6th)

PSC received the following charges from the Faculty Senate (indicated in bold) and the PSC took the following actions.

1. Review the policy on “Background Checks of Faculty” being drafted by the Human Resources Department, including confirmation of degree completion.

Action: PSC approved a revised draft of the HR policy on background checks (appended). PSC also endorses that HR do more than just Federal Sexual Offender checks before making offers to new faculty. PSC endorsed education verification and 7 year criminal background checks. (Dec 4th)

2. Continue the review of Faculty Code provisions on guidelines for the use of course assistants and make recommendations for necessary changes.

Action: PSC issued a new interpretation to the Faculty Code Chapter 1, Part C, Section 2, a. Guidelines for the Use of Course Assistants (Report to Faculty Senate December 4th 2013) appended. The Academic and Student Affairs Committee concurred in the interpretation at the February 2014 Board of Trustees meeting.

3. Formulate recommendations for streamlining the faculty evaluation process in order to reduce workload on evaluatees, departments, head officers, the Faculty Advancement Committee, and the Dean of the University. Propose amendments to the Faculty Code that are entailed by these recommendations.

Action: PSC addressed this charge with a proposal for modification in the timeline and also the participants in evaluations after tenure. The PSC declined to propose the amendments to the Faculty Code and instead recommends to the Faculty Senate that the Senate bring the proposed changes before the full faculty (March 13 2014 with communication to Faculty Senate Liaison March 31).

PSC proposed:

- i. 3rd-year associate professor review to follow model of 1st- and 2nd-year assistant professor reviews. Parties involved in evaluation: evaluatee, head officer, and dean.
- ii. Following promotion to professor, faculty reviews will occur every five years and be streamlined. Parties involved in evaluation: evaluatee, head officer, and the

dean or a designated member of the FAC. This recommendation reflects the PSC's sense that the review process has become unduly cumbersome and need not (unless requested) involve the whole department beyond promotion to full. Because faculty value FAC letters of review, in part because the FAC letter sets the evaluation in a context larger than that set by a chair, who is also a colleague, the PSC recommends that FAC involvement ought to be preserved.

4. Collaborate with Library, Media, and Information Services to assess the viability of the use of electronically-administered Instructor and Course Evaluation Forms.

Action: This charge was discussed at considerable length with some investigations into experiences of other schools. PSC believes that any move to electronic collection of student evaluations should be first discussed by the full faculty. PSC does endorse that completed Instructor and Course Evaluation Forms should be scanned, rather than copied in tri-color and that the original copies should be filed with the Academic Dean as well as the scanned pdf versions. The evaluatee and the department head should receive copies of the pdf files.

5. Work with LMIS to assess the viability of a process for electronic submission of faculty evaluation files.

6. Outline guidelines in the “Faculty Evaluation Criteria and Procedures” document for submission of evaluation materials in electronic form.

Action: Charges #5 and 6 were worked on together. We have determined a process for electronic file submission via Moodle. PSC endorses this as an option. We are in the process of writing new text for the Faculty Evaluation Standards and Criteria document for 2014-2015 to include the explanation of this option and have a link to the procedures for doing so (Cindy Riche and Lauren Nicandri are providing the linked document).

7. Consider limiting the number of colleague observers who can visit any given class session during an evaluation process.

Action: PSC revised the language in the buff document concerning class visitation as follows:

“PSC affirms that adequate visitation requires at least two visits by each of two faculty members and recommends at least four separate class sessions be visited across more than one semester”

PSC debated specifically limiting the number of colleague observers in a class but determined that the larger concern is having adequate visits.

Other actions of the Professional Standards Committee.

1. Approved the Biology Department Evaluation Guidelines revision (4/10/14).
2. Reviewed the Neuroscience Caruthers Chair addendum to the Biology Department evaluation guidelines (approval pending).

3. Approved the request from the Physical Therapy program to delete section six of program evaluation guidelines (4/10/14) .
4. Addressed the following query from a Department Chair (4/10/14):

“Are the academic deans subject to the professional duties and obligations as spelled out in the Faculty Code?”

PSC affirmed that the By Laws defines the academic deans as members of the faculty. After clarifying that the language of the Faculty Code is “responsibilities” not “obligation”, PSC affirmed that Chapter One Part D does pertain to the academic deans. As indicated in Section 2 f. “there may be adjustments in the normal balance” in assignment of specific duties.

ACTIONS to be completed this year:

Revision of Faculty Evaluation Standards and Criteria document, to include recommendations on limiting the letter length in faculty evaluations, and the above mentioned clarification on class visitation, and guidelines for electronic submission of faculty evaluation files.

Recommended Charges for upcoming year:

1. Return to the issue of electronically administered instructor and course evaluations with the charge to PSC to develop a faculty survey to assess the potential benefits and concerns of Puget Sound faculty regarding this possibility. After gathering data, provide the Senate with a summary of the problems to solve prior to implementation of any electronic option.
2. Review all of the PSC interpretations of the Faculty Code to see if any have become obsolete by more recent interpretations and to ensure consistency of all interpretations with current practice and policies on campus.

Respectfully Submitted



Jennifer Hastings
PSC Chair 2013-2014

Appendix:

Background Check Policy

Draft November 2013

University of Puget Sound is committed to providing a safe and secure environment conducive to academic and professional excellence. To do so, it is the college's practice to hire well-qualified candidates for employment whose past behavior does not suggest a risk of future harm to the campus community.

Employment offers for regular full-time, part-time or temporary faculty and staff positions, whether to individuals new to university employment, individuals re-employed by the university, or individuals transferred to new positions, will be contingent upon the results of appropriate background checks. The nature of the position and the information disclosed during the application/interview process will determine the scope of the background checks applicable to the job. **For faculty positions appropriate background checks will be determined by HR in consultation with PSC.**

Relevant adverse information discovered through the background check process will be reviewed by a Human Resources representative and the applicable Vice President/Dean. Adverse information discovered in the background check will not automatically disqualify an individual from employment. Decisions concerning employment will be made on a case-by-case basis.

Information gained from any background checks process will only be shared on a need-to-know basis and in compliance with applicable laws and regulations.

Approved with inserted revision 12-4-13

Interpretation of Chapter I, Part C, Section 2, a. Guidelines for the Use of Course Assistants (Report to Faculty Senate December 4, 2013): Current

Definition of Course Assistants

Course Assistants are either paid employees of the university or students receiving compensation in a different form for their assistance in coursework.

Responsibilities

The responsibility for teaching and instruction at the University of Puget Sound resides with the faculty members. The university recognizes, however, that in special cases it is appropriate or necessary to utilize the services of students as course assistants. Course assistants do not replace full or part time faculty. Rather they extend and augment the ability of a faculty member to fulfill the objectives of a particular class. The use of course assistants in no way reduces, replaces, or eliminates the authority or responsibility a faculty member has for a course as specified in the Faculty Code.

Requirements for Departmental Guidelines for Course Assistants

Specific activities for course assistants will of necessity vary (from department to department and from course to course). Each department must develop a clear statement for each course concerning the use of course assistants. The statement should discuss, at least, the following: (1) faculty supervision, (2) the role of course assistants in the classroom or laboratory, (3) the specific tasks assigned to course assistants, (4) the degree and type of interaction between the course assistants and students, (5) the role of course assistants in grading and evaluating student work, (6) the expected number of hours of work, and (7) the method of evaluating performance of the CA; (8) how confidentiality of sensitive material is ensured (in some cases course assistants will have access to confidential information e.g., grades, performance records, or evaluations about the students enrolled in the class. The department and the supervisor must make every effort to restrict course assistants' access to such information to a minimum. Course assistants must be made aware of the sensitive nature of such information and should be required to sign a non-disclosure agreement. Abuse of this privilege should be grounds for dismissal of a course assistant from employment.); and (9) the process of selection of course assistants (Each department must develop a procedure for selecting course assistants which is consistent with both the needs of the department and with the prevailing regulations and rules applicable to equal employment. Selection criteria should correspond to the departmental statements about the duties and responsibilities of the course assistant position. The primary concern of the department in selecting course assistants must be the ability of individuals to perform satisfactorily the expected functions of a course assistant. To the extent possible, departments should select students who qualify for university matching funds under existing work-study programs. Applications for positions should be solicited from all qualified students. Notification to both selected individuals and unsuccessful applicants should be in writing. The department should ensure that each selection is based on rational criteria and procedures so that they are not perceived as arbitrary or capricious. The department should be willing to discuss its decisions with unsuccessful applicants. After the selection process is completed the department is responsible for working with the university's Office of Student Employment to execute the appropriate documents as applicable).

This statement should be made available to all prospective course assistants and reviewed specifically with all course assistants at the beginning of their employment.

Supervision and Responsibility of Course Assistants

Each course assistant must be under the direct guidance and supervision of a faculty member. All course assistant duties with respect to grading must be limited to objective evaluation. It is the responsibility of the supervisor to see that the course assistant successfully fulfills the requirements of the job. The supervisor will meet in a timely fashion with the course assistant to develop appropriate material for the course and to assess the course assistant's performance.

The supervisor, or faculty member responsible for the course, should inform the students enrolled in the course about the role and duties of each course assistant. Students should also be informed that they have the right to appeal decisions made by any course assistant to the faculty member or supervisor.

Role of Professional Standards Committee

Since course assistants perform some of the activities and have some of the responsibilities of faculty members, it is in the interest of the university to monitor their use. Thus, each department employing course assistants should submit to the Professional Standards Committee a document which explains the duties, responsibilities, and supervision of course assistants and which should be regularly reviewed by the PSC. The committee will review any revised departmental statement and determine whether it is appropriate. When the department obtains committee approval it may then employ course assistants in accordance with these procedures and the departmental document. Current departmental statement regarding the use of the CA stay in effect until a revised version is requested by the PSC.

Academic Standards Committee 2013-2014 Year-End Report

I. Membership and meetings of the Academic Standards Committee:

Faculty members of the 2013-2014 Academic Standards Committee included Kenneth Clark, Greg Elliott, (S), Karl Fields, James Jasinski, Kristin Johnson, Mary Rose Lamb, Jan Leuchtenberger, Martins Linauts, Gary McCall, Jill Nealey-Moore, Don Share, Keith Ward, and Ann Wilson. Student representatives on the ASC were Drew Anderson and Daniel Laesch. Ex-Officio members included Debbie Chee, Sunil Kukreja, Brad Tomhave, and Landon Wade. Library liaison is Lori Ricigliano.

Martins Linauts chaired the ASC during Fall 2013, and Karl Fields chaired the committee during Spring 2014.

The ASC petitions subcommittee normally met every week and the ASC policy subcommittee normally met every other week.

II. Summary of Work on the Formal Charges from the Faculty Senate to the ASC:

Original Charges

1. Continue consideration of options for course schedule framework revisions with the goals of meeting the faculty's teaching needs (e.g., rethinking balance of 2, 3, and 4 day per week scheduling options), using available campus spaces more efficiently, maintaining commitment to 4:00-6:00 p.m. curricular and co-curricular program offerings, and locating a common hour.

The ASC addressed this issue at its meeting of September 20, 2013 and determined, following a review of the history of the matter, that this charge would need to be postponed until PeopleSoft implementation can permit the collection and analysis of relevant data. (In December 2013, the ASC submitted a letter to Academic Vice President Kris Bartanen expressing concern regarding the dysfunction of PeopleSoft and its negative impact on Puget Sound's academic division.)

The ASC recommends that the Senate once again include this item on its charges to the Committee next year.

2. Review the wisdom of a policy change in consultation with the curriculum committee that would permit students to earn two Baccalaureate degrees concurrently.

The ASC addressed this issue at its meetings of October 4, 2013, October 18, 2013, and December 6, 2013. The 2012-13 ASC Petitions Subcommittee had received a number of petitions for permitting concurrent dual degrees and it was determined that the university should establish a policy rather than relying exclusively on the petitioning process. Following discussion and consultation with the Curriculum Committee, a joint subcommittee from the two committees was formed. This subcommittee met, developed a policy that was

subsequently approved by both committees and ultimately approved by the Faculty Senate. The policy permits students to earn either a second baccalaureate degree (with a minimum of 8 additional units) or simultaneous baccalaureate degrees (with a minimum total of 40 units).

3. Clarify, and if necessary, amend current policies regarding a student's right to privacy when asked to demonstrate "exceptional circumstances" in order to receive a W from an instructor when withdrawing from a course during weeks 7-12 of the semester.

The ASC addressed this issue at its meetings of October 18, 2013, November 15, 2013, December 6, 2013 and February 6, 2014 meetings. Following extensive discussion and a guest presentation from a concerned faculty member, the ASC determined it could best address the matter by going beyond the original Senate charge and Saucedo noted that the committee went beyond the charge and completely revamping university policy on withdrawal. The new policy, endorsed by the Faculty Senate in its March 10th meeting, shifts the WF "default" from week 7 to week 11 and streamlines the petition process in several ways. The new petition policy permits but does not require faculty input and allows for an advocate to speak on behalf of the student.

4. Develop a policy on academic credit for prior academic work completed by international students.

The ASC discussed this charge in its April 10, 2014 meeting and, after consideration, confirmed that the general policy and specific practices, including the established processes of consultation with relevant outside agencies and consultants as needed, are satisfactory.

Additional Charges

5. Consider the policies and procedures associated with record keeping and formal communications with students in cases involving a first violation of academic integrity.

The ASC discussed this charge at its meetings on February 6, 2014 and February 20, 2014. The university has received complaints from students and parents who did not fully understand the gravity of a first violation of academic integrity or the consequences of a subsequent offense. Current policy restricts communication regarding a first offense to the student and faculty member. The committee concluded that sending a letter to a first-offending student would impress upon the student the gravity of the situation and would be an improvement over the current system in which faculty members may or may not fully explain the consequences to the student. The committee has considered one draft of a first-offense letter and will discuss revisions at its May 1, 2014 meeting.

If this is not finalized in this meeting, the ASC recommends that the Senate include this item on its charges to the ASC next year.

6. Consider University policies related to accepting transfer credits either from incoming students or students already matriculated at Puget Sound (including transfer of credits from community college beyond the current "junior status" of 16 units, transfer of Running Start

credits, and inclusion of exam scores from the Cambridge Advanced International Certificate of Education in the grouping with current AP and IB transfer credits).

The ASC discussed this charge at its meetings on February 20, 2014, March 6, 2014, March 27, 2014, and April 10, 2014 meetings. Discussions initially covered the transfer of Running Start credit and have included a guest presentation by a student proposing a change to current policy and the solicitation of additional information from the Office of Admissions. Concerning the transfer of Running Start credit, the Committee determined that the existing policy is satisfactory but that reviewing the published materials would be beneficial. The Offices of the Registrar and Admissions will work together to review and , as necessary, revise published materials that are made available to prospective students regarding the University's Running Start credit transfer policy and will report their efforts to the ASC. The committee recommends that the Senate include this review and report item on its charges to the ASC next year.

The ASC has also begun to consider transfer credit from community colleges beyond the current 16 unit ceiling.

III. ASC Recommendations for Charges to the 2014-15 Academic Standards Committee

- 1. Continue consideration of options for course schedule framework revisions with the goals of meeting the faculty's teaching needs (e.g., rethinking balance of 2, 3, and 4 day per week scheduling options), using available campus spaces more efficiently, maintaining commitment to 4:00-6:00 p.m. curricular and co-curricular program offerings, and locating a common hour.*
- 2. Review the results of efforts made by the Offices of the Registrar and Admissions to appraise and revise the published materials made available to prospective students regarding the University's transfer of Running Start credit policy.*
- 3. Consider University policies related to accepting transfer credits either from incoming students or students already matriculated at Puget Sound (including transfer of credits from community college beyond the current "junior status" of 16 units and inclusion of exam scores from the Cambridge Advanced International Certificate of Education in the grouping with current AP and IB transfer credits).*
- 4. Consider adopting a policy for study away (study abroad) medical withdrawal involving third party organizations.*
- 5. Consider revision of the incomplete policies in regard under what circumstances to assign an incomplete and how to determine appropriate time to allow for completion.*

IV. Summary of Petitions and Hearing Boards

Petitions

At the September 6, 2013, meeting of the Committee, the Registrar was delegated the authority to convene a Petition Preview Team of Associate Dean Sunil Kukreja and Academic Advising Director Landon Wade to approve petitions submitted by students if the Preview Team unanimously finds the Petitions Sub-Committee would approve a particular petition and would not object to the Preview Team doing so. Delegating this authority relieves the Petitions Sub-Committee of work on ordinary issues for which the Sub-Committee has a history of approval.

The year-end petitions report for 2012-13 included petitions acted upon from August 30, 2012, to April 17, 2013. Petitions activity for the year continued during the period of April 18 to September 5, 2013. During this time, 80 petitions were acted upon with 64 approved and 16 denied.

To complete the **report for 2012-13**, 289 total petitions were acted upon with 246 approved and 43 denied. Of these 289 petitions, more than half involved the following 4 actions:

71 Registrations with a Schedule Conflict

37 Late Registrations

33 Medical Withdrawals

28 Readmissions or Reinstatements from Dismissal or Suspension

169 Total (58%)

The year-end petitions **report for 2013-14** covers the period from September 6, 2013, to April 2, 2014. During this time, 194 petitions were acted upon with 177 approved and 17 denied. Of these 194 petitions, more than half involved the following 4 actions:

69 Late Registrations

26 Medical Withdrawals

24 Readmissions or Reinstatements from Dismissal or Suspension

20 Registrations with a Schedule Conflict

139 Total (72%)

Hearing Boards

On behalf of the ASC, Sunil Kukreja convened Hearing Boards during the period between June 2013-April 2014 to review the following:

- 5 cases of academic dishonesty
- 3 reinstatement hearings

In addition, three students who had been dismissed came before the ASC petitions subcommittee as part of their reinstatement process. All three reinstatements were successful.

Submitted by Karl Fields on behalf of the Academic Standards Committee
April 21, 2014

April 21, 2014

TO: Faculty Senate

FR: Alexa Tullis, Chair of the Faculty Advancement Committee

On behalf of Cathy Hale, Fred Hamel, Suzanne Holland, Kent Hooper, Alexa Tullis, and Kris Bartanen

RE: 2013-2014 Annual Report

The Faculty Advancement Committee this year will have completed 53 evaluations:

Type of Review	Number and Status of Evaluations
Tenure	6 (4 open, 2 closed)
Tenure and promotion to associate	7 (5 open, 2 closed)
Promotion to associate	2 (both open)
Promotion to professor	7 (3 open, 4 closed)
3 year assistant/clinical assistant	2 (1 open, 1 closed)
3 year associate	10 (9 streamlined, 1 closed)
5 year professor	17 (3 open, 2 closed, 12 streamlined)
3 year instructor	4 (3 open, 1 closed)
Total	53

The committee has forwarded evaluations for tenure, tenure and promotion, promotion to associate, and promotion to professor to the President. Some of these cases were considered by the Board of Trustees at the February 2014 meeting; some will be considered at the May 2014 meeting.

The Advancement Committee met 3 hours per week from October through December 2013, and 2 hours or 3 hours (alternating) each week for the Spring 2014 semester.

Members of the Advancement Committee have continued to be attentive to ideas about time- and cost-saving in our evaluation process without reducing the quality of the formative and summative reviews of faculty.

- The Committee has intentionally reduced the length of letters by efforts to transmit the committee members' independent assessment and reduce duplicative quotations from department and/or colleague letters; members report that this has created a substantial time savings.
- The Committee continues to struggle to affirm patterns of class visits (which takes our time) and encourages head officers to provide a chart at the beginning of deliberative summary letters (who visited what classes and when) in order to document clearly all class visits conducted by colleagues.
- The Committee has found files submitted via Moodle to be easy to access and supports the Professional Standards Committee's encouragement of digital file submission (for which we recognize that PSC guidelines are forthcoming).
- The Committee has reviewed and informally endorsed the PSC's ideas for greater streamlining of non-change-of-status reviews (three-year associate, five-year professor, three-year instructor). We suggest that an outgoing FAC member could collaborate with a PSC member to draft proposed language for 2014-2015 amendment of the *Faculty Code*, with changes effective for 2015-2016 reviews.

- The Committee continues to encourage Puget Sound to move to electronically-administered Instructor and Course Evaluation Forms.

The Advancement Committee has received a follow-up request from the University Enrichment Committee to establish a junior and senior faculty research award, to be recommended by the Committee to the Dean as are faculty teaching awards. The Committee will consider that proposal after completing the 2013-2014 reviews still in process.

Given the particular pattern of member turnover (three three-year terms concluding and two two-year terms concluding due to a sabbatical and a member's scheduled review), FAC needs five new members for 2014-2015 – with four to join the Committee in Fall 2014 and one to join the Committee in Spring 2015. Alexa Tullis has agreed to serve a seventh semester in Fall 2014 in order to provide greater continuity for the tenure and promotion reviews. The Dean asks that the Senate commend all five FAC members for their significant service as they conclude their terms.

The Faculty Advancement Committee will discuss other ideas after it finishes with the 2013-2014 evaluations and reserves the opportunity to provide an addendum to this report to the Faculty Senate at or after semester's end.