

**Faculty Senate Meeting  
May 4, 2015  
McCormick Room, Library**

**Senate Members Present**

Kris Bartanen, Bill Beardsley, Derek Buescher, Andrew Gardner, Bill Haltom, Zaixin Hong, Nakisha Renee Jones, Andrea Kueter, Pierre Ly, Emelie Peine, Maria Sampen, Leslie Saucedo, Mike Segawa, Jonathan Stockdale

**Guests**

Alva Butcher, Alisa Kessel, Dawn Padula, Brad Reich, George Tomlin, Kirsten Wilbur

**Tubert called the meeting to order at 4:03**

**Announcements**

Alisa Kessel announced the new Victim Advocate and Sexual Assault Prevention Educator training program for faculty and staff. This program will help provide support for sexual assault victims on campus. Faculty and staff interested in serving as victim advocates can contact Kessel for more information. Training sessions are planned for late summer or early fall.

Tubert introduced the new ASUPS President, Nakisha Renée Jones.

**Approval of minutes from April 20, 2015**

M/S/P with minor changes

**Election of two replacement senators for Fall 2015**

Senators voted by paper ballot. Rachel DeMotts (Politics and Government) and John Wesley (English) were elected as replacement senators for Fall 2015.

**End of Year Report: University Enrichment Committee (UEC)**

UEC Chair Dawn Padula said that the committee had been very productive this year. The UEC evaluated and awarded student and faculty research awards in the Fall and Spring, evaluated release time awards for faculty in Spring, determined the Dirk Andrew Phibbs Award by looking at faculty research proposals in the Fall and Spring and making an award recommendation in the Spring, and chose the Register Lecturer. The committee completed all five of the Senate charges for the 2014-15 academic year. Padula reported that the committee felt that the size of the committee was appropriate (seven faculty, two students and one ex-officio member of the administration). The committee felt that all of its work was meaningful and that no work was superfluous.

Padula reported that the UEC submitted a proposal to Associate Dean Martin Jackson to ask the Budget Task Force to increase the student research award budget and faculty travel budget. She noted that the committee has seen a marked rise in the number of proposals in these areas over the course of several years. Bartanen stated that the BTF proposal had been approved and that the UEC would be receiving more funding to support faculty and student research and travel.

Padula stated that the UEC devised a standardized rubric/scoring system for student research awards. This was done in part as a response to concerns brought to the UEC by the Occupational Therapy Faculty. The new rubric/scoring system makes the process more transparent and increases communication flow and uniformity from year to year. Padula reported that the UEC would like to devise a similar system with regard to Faculty Research Awards and would like the Senate to consider charging the UEC with this task for 2015-16.

Haltom stated that he liked that the UEC requested but two charges from the Senate for 2015-16 and recommended to itself other charges.

Saucedo thanked the UEC for the work it had done to secure additional funding for student research. She also thanked the committee for establishing a rubric for evaluating Student Research Awards. She said that this was very helpful.

Gardner said he was very happy to see the increase to faculty travel budgets. He asked if funds would be distributed in the same way as the past or if there would be any changes to the awarding system.

Padula said that because faculty travel requests go directly to the Associate Dean's office (as opposed to the UEC) she felt that the same process of awarding research travel would still be intact.

Gardner asked if the process for distributing student travel awards would be the same.

Padula stated that the UEC hadn't discussed increasing the caps on student travel but would be very willing to do so if the Senate felt that it was an appropriate charge.

Tubert said that the issue to discuss might be whether we should increase the cap on the awards or increase the number of awards that could be given.

Senate moved to accept report.

Seconded and accepted unanimously with no further discussion.

## **End of Year Report: International Education Committee (IEC):**

IEC Chair, Alva Butcher told the Senate that the IEC felt the size of the committee was appropriate because of the need to have perspectives from a wide range of disciplines from across campus. She reported that the IEC would like more junior faculty appointed so that newer faculty can become more informed about study abroad options at Puget Sound.

Butcher stated that the IEC examined a number of international programs and eliminated redundant programs. This year they looked at UK programs, keeping four and eliminating 14. Hispanic Studies also submitted a list of programs to be eliminated. The IEC approved Hispanic Studies' recommendations and eliminated seven programs.

In reference to Senate Charge 1, Butcher said that the IEC was continuing to receive information from providers regarding sexual violence. The Office of International Programs is creating a spreadsheet with the information that has been collected and is putting together a pre-departure sheet with this information for Puget Sound students. The IEC has made strides in addressing this charge but requests that it be carried over to next year.

Butcher mentioned that the IEC did some work with regard to Charge #4 (*Investigate and recommend ways to significantly increase the enrollment of international students on campus.*). It recommended that Puget Sound faculty be given admissions materials to carry with them with traveling abroad.

Gardner asked for explanation with regard to the sentence "Roy emphasized that departments needed to take ownership of specific programs and perhaps set up contacts with faculty." (IEC End of Year Report, Charge 4, paragraph 2, sentence 2).

Butcher stated that if a department is very committed to an exchange program then the program is more successful. She explained that the university needs to have equilibrium with regard to exchange programs (our students can go abroad but we need students from abroad to come to our school). In order for this to be successful, departments need to be behind maintaining this exchange.

Saucedo asked for clarification with regard to superfluous work (IEC End of Year Report, final paragraph: *Over the year, the committee reviewed several student petitions and study abroad applications. Some of that work seemed superfluous. The committee recommends that it only needs to approve student petitions and study abroad applications to OIP for which there is a particular problem. Routine petitions and applications should be handled within OIP.*)

Segawa stated that with regard to Charge 6, *Work with the Office of Institutional Research to review and evaluate the returning questionnaire for study abroad students*, he felt that the Senate had clarified this. He recalled the Senate talking

about assessing student learning outcomes and asking the IEC to develop a more substantive, robust assessment of the student experience when abroad.

Tubert stated that the Senate should provide additional clarification with regard to this charge next year.

Segawa asked what protocol was in place if providers do not respond to requests for information regarding their sexual violence policies, programs and support procedures. He also asked what the IEC would do if it received a response that was less than satisfactory.

Butcher said that with regard to the first question, the IEC hasn't addressed this yet. With regard to the second question, she stated that she imagined the IEC would drop the program.

Stockdale asked if the shift in taking away merit awards was a conscious decision to reduce the number of students studying abroad. He thought that this was done because study abroad expenses were growing out of balance with the budget. Therefore, he added, this seemed to be the intended effect even though pedagogically, this is not what we would like to see. He went on to ask about the surplus in the Study Abroad Instructional Budget and whether it could be used for scholarships to encourage students to study abroad.

Bartanen clarified that Study Abroad Instructional Budget is the budget used to pay the cost of students enrolling in study abroad programs. In a year that there is an annual surplus, the most common place the university uses the surplus is to add to the endowment for financial aid. The Study Abroad Instructional Budget is not scholarship money but academic operating dollars. It cannot be used for scholarships for subsequent years.

Tubert asked how decisions to drop or add programs are made. She asked how much consultation is done with departments.

Butcher stated that the IEC eliminates redundant programs. The IEC keeps programs that show good variety or are specifically requested by a department. The IEC also looks at the majors of the students studying in specific programs and the cost of housing students in specific programs (programs with direct enrollment have a lower cost when compared to programs that use a housing provider).

Tubert asked whether a department could request a program to remain included.

Butcher said yes.

Senate moved to accept report.

Seconded and accepted unanimously with no further discussion.

## **End of Year Report: Student Life Committee (SLC):**

SLC Chair, Brad Reich stated that the SLC has two primary responsibilities: to provide staffing/support for a variety of boards (Integrity Board, Honor Court and Sexual Misconduct Board) and to address charges set by the Senate. With regard to the first responsibility, Reich stated that some staffing responsibilities take much more time than others. He noted that scheduling is often challenging because of teaching conflicts. He stated that normally only a third of the 12-person committee is available at any given time to serve on one of these boards.

Reich applauded the efforts of Poppy Fry with regard to her work as the SLC representative to the Sexual and Gender Violence Committee.

Buescher noted that Charge 6, as written in the SLC End of Year Report was not the charge the Senate approved. The SLC report contains the following language:

***Charge 6:*** *The Faculty Senate requests that the Student Life Committee in the 2014-2015 Academic Year investigate the principles, policies, and practices that guide decision-makers institutional as well as individual in determining 1) what sorts of expressions or activities lie within protected "freedom of expression;" 2) what sorts of expressions or activities fall outside protected "freedom of expression;" and 3) what sorts of expressions or activities "straddle" protected "freedom of expression."*

Buescher stated that the actual approved Senate charge was as follows:

*The Faculty Senate charge the Professional Standards and Student Life Committees to collaboratively work with the Bias-Hate Education Response Team to: 1) investigate existing University policies pertaining to the display of materials for campus/public consumption, 2) make recommendations for changes or additions to the existing University policies including the possibility of a statement regarding freedom of expression, and 3) consider revision or clarification of the procedures for "immediate response" to reported incidences of Bias-Hate ("Response Protocol of Bias-Hate Incidents," Section V.B.1.).*

Buescher stated that although he appreciated that the SLC did some work on this issue, he was concerned by the fact that the SLC did not address the charge provided by the Senate.

Tubert asked whether the language in the SLC report was an earlier draft. She asked that the correct language to be re-forwarded to the SLC.

Buescher stated that he was unclear as to what the SLC would like the Senate to do with regard to Charge 2 (see "Motion to Revise SLC Procedures" in SLC Report).

Reich replied by saying that he was also unclear as to what the Senate was to do in response to the motion proposed in the report. Reich stated that his personal belief

was that the Senate could turn this into a standing charge for the committee. He felt that in multiple instances, Senate charges were either too broad or too specific. He pointed to a charge that included the language “examine the efficacy of CHWS” as an example of this. He felt that the SLC did not have the data to do this kind of work. He said that charges like this were not an efficient use of the SLC’s time.

Tubert stated that the Senate had discussed the SLC’s motion at an earlier Senate meeting. Her understanding was that the motion dealt with the internal workings of the committee and therefore the Senate didn’t have to endorse it in any way.

Reich stated that the motion could represent both minimal change and significant change. In one sense, he said that it would simply formalize the relationship with the Dean of Students. He also said that it would improve efficiency and help the SLC know exactly with whom it should be working. This will streamline the work process and prevent “stop and go.”

Saucedo said that she thought it made sense for the “Motion to Revise SLC Procedures” to remain an internal motion for now. If the Senate felt that the SLC should have more members then it would need to recommend a change in the Bylaws.

Stockdale stated that it seemed that the “Motion to Revise SLC Procedures” was just ratifying what the SLC was already doing.

Reich said that the staffing needs of the SLC might change from year to year depending on the number of ad hoc committees the SLC is required to staff. He said that some of the SLC charges are very narrow and some are very broad which makes a difference in who will be involved in carrying them out.

Buescher asked which SLC charges do not require an ad hoc committee.

Reich said that Charge 1 was carried out without an ad hoc committee. Charge 2 didn’t require ad hoc group. Charge 3 didn’t require an ad hoc committee. He said that Charge 6 absolutely required an ad hoc committee.

Peine asked whether the ad hoc committees were any different from the working groups of the Curriculum Committee.

Reich stated that Charge 1 would have followed the working group model but he didn’t think that Charge 3 or Charge 6 would have functioned this way. Segawa said that the Senate made an adjustment a few years ago to add service on Honor Court Board to the SLC duties. He went on to say that the workload might vary from year to year. He gave an example with regard to admissions stating that if his admissions colleagues bring him an awful first year class, then there will be more work for the Honor Court. He said that almost all the work done by the SLC has to be done in conjunction with other departments and committees.

Senate moved to accept report. Seconded.

Tubert said that the Senate still needed to address the issue of the language of Charge 2 and whether or not the Senate needed to endorse the SLC's "Motion to Revise SLC Procedures."

Segawa asked whether it was the sense of the Senate that this was an internal procedural piece or something that warranted further discussion.

The report was accepted unanimously without further discussion.

### **End of Year Report: Committee on Diversity (COD):**

COD Chair, George Tomlin stated that the COD was very busy this academic year. The COD continued to monitor and support diversification on campus. Tomlin said that diversity among faculty was an important component of this and although recruiting a diverse applicant pool is important, it was also crucial to retain these faculty members at an acceptable rate. Because the COD has been collecting information on hiring and retention rates for several years it is starting to see a bigger picture.

Tomlin said that COD Duty #5 ("To work with colleagues to maintain an educational environment that welcomes and supports diversity even as it protects and assures the rights of academic freedom outlined in the Faculty Code") introduces issues similar to those the SLC faces.

Tomlin highlighted the charge listed on under Committee Duty 8, Charge 2. He stated that he expected this charge to roll over to next year and added that the COD does not yet know what a "picture of balance" should look like.

Tomlin pointed out a mistake in the report (page 2, "Hiring Data"). He asked that we delete the words "with four searches pending" in the fourth paragraph because not all of the pending searches are tenure-line searches.

Tomlin briefly discussed the Diversity Liaison Program and underscored the COD's recommendation that in faculty searches, the Diversity Liaison appointment should be someone other than chair of the search committee. He added that the university should maintain a large pool of trained people who can effectively carry out the role of Diversity Liaison.

Tomlin recommended that the Senate "interpret the bylaws" which state that the COD should have "at least seven faculty" and consider adding two faculty to the COD. He noted that the COD had a lot of big projects coming up in the future and that the committee didn't feel that it had a large enough body of faculty to complete the requested work.

Stockdale thanked Tomlin and the COD for all of its work. He asked for clarification regarding the Diversity Liaison.

Tomlin said that the Diversity Liaison can be an internal person in the department but can also be someone outside of the department. He said that according to Michael Benitez (Chief Diversity Officer, Dean of Diversity and Inclusion) that the process works best to insure a diverse candidate pool when the Diversity Liaison is not playing a dual role in the search. Benitez bases this on the fact that he is the contact person for each Diversity Liaison. Tomlin added that as society is diversifying, we need a pool of faculty to attract a diverse population of students to campus.

Senate moved to accept report.

Seconded and accepted unanimously with no further discussion.

### **End of Year Report: Institutional Review Board (IRB):**

Kirsten Wilbur, IRB chair, reported that the IRB priorities this year were to finish the revision to the IRB Handbook (completed Fall 2014). She said that the committee was expanded last year to address the problem of not having departmental designates anymore. The IRB is working on completing its new website. The website should streamline and simplify the IRB process and provide direct links to forms for student and faculty.

Gardner asked if the IRB Handbook changed in size.

Wilbur said that the Handbook is about the same, although perhaps a few pages shorter because there are no longer departmental designates.

Gardner asked whether Charge 4 was concluded and if not, whether it would be useful to have this charge again next year.

Wilbur said that some of the issues had been resolved but some were still ongoing.

Haltom moved to extend meeting by five minutes. Seconded/Approved.

Haltom asked for clarification as to what the acronym, CITI stood for and requested that a new version of the IRB End of Year Report include this information.

Tubert asked why the IRB was not making any changes regarding oral histories.

Wilbur said that many colleges do make exceptions for oral histories. She said that the IRB needs an MOU with regard to this and that currently, things still need to go through the IRB.

Segawa asked whether the MOU was in place.

Wilbur said that an MOU was in place for Psychology and in a draft stage for Sociology.

Senate moved to accept report.

Seconded and accepted unanimously with no further discussion.

Motion to adjourn, 5:35pm.

Prepared by Dr. Maria Sampen, Professor of Music, Violin

Respectfully Submitted,

Pierre Ly, Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Appendix A: UEC end of year report

Appendix B: IEC end of year report

Appendix C: SLC end of year report

Appendix D: Original senate wording of "Freedom of expression" charge to SLC.

Appendix E: CoD end of year report

Appendix F: IRB end of year report

## **University Enrichment Committee End of Year Report 2014-2015**

### **MEMBERSHIP:**

**Faculty:** Roger Allen (spring Faculty Research subcommittee chair), Terry Beck, Erin Colbert-White (spring Student Research subcommittee chair), Mark Martin (spring only), Dawn Padula (chair), Sara Shapiro (fall only—fall Student Research subcommittee chair), Jess Smith (fall Faculty Research subcommittee chair), and Randy Worland

**Students:** Kabir Jensen, Aaron Pomerantz

**Ex Officio:** Sunil Kukreja (Associate Dean)

**Senate Liaison:** Maria Sampen

### **MEETING DATES:**

**Fall 2014:** September 9, October 7, November 4 and December 2

**Spring 2015:** January 28, February 18, March 11, March 25, April 22 and April 29

### **GENERAL UEC ACTIVITY:**

The UEC successfully completed all of the regular yearly duties assigned, including evaluating and awarding student research proposals in the fall (November) and spring (April), evaluating and awarding faculty research proposals in the fall (December) and spring (March), hosting the Register Lecture (November), evaluating and awarding Release Time Awards for faculty (February), determining the recipient of the Dirk Andrew Phibbs Award (March), and the evaluation of applications for the purpose of selecting the 2016 Register Lecturer (April).

### **SENATE CHARGES:**

**The senate charges to the 2014-2015 University Enrichment Committee were as follows:**

1. Continue to pursue ways to showcase creative and scholarly work that is supported by UEC funding.
2. Continue to pursue the implementation of a Scholarship Award that directly parallels the existing Teaching Awards.
3. Investigate the feasibility and desirability of implementing three separate application deadlines for three separate funding periods.
4. Formalize and publicize rules for a streamlined application for UEC summer student research support.
5. With respect to the work of the committee during 2014-2015, indicate in your end of year report whether the size of the committee was appropriate and identify any committee work that seemed superfluous.

## **UEC ACTIONS IN RESPONSE TO SENATE CHARGES:**

### **1. Continue to pursue ways to showcase creative and scholarly work that is supported by UEC funding.**

The consensus of the UEC is that there are already actions in place to disseminate and showcase the creative and scholarly work supported by the UEC. Sunil Kukreja reported to the committee that his office is in the habit of forwarding information regarding particularly noteworthy or significant projects that come to the UEC for funding directly to the Office of Communications. In addition, all members are in agreement that dissemination of noteworthy projects happens as a result of the committee supporting publications, travel for student or faculty presentations, or ongoing research that results in a published paper, project or presentation. It was also agreed that the UEC itself (in particular the UEC webpage) is likely not the most effective or appropriate venue to disseminate information on supported work.

The committee did agree, however, that an additional way of showcasing work supported by the UEC would be to reach out to Dean Bartanen in the hopes of her announcing at the fall faculty dinner the annual recipient of the Dirk Andrew Phibbs Award. The UEC chooses the recipient of this award from the pool of faculty research proposals received throughout the year.<sup>1</sup> The UEC has reached out to Dean Bartanen for this purpose, and have provided her with the award MOU for more background and context.

### **2. Continue to pursue the implementation of a Scholarship Award that directly parallels the existing Teaching Awards.**

The committee learned that the latest version of the document entitled, “Criteria for Faculty Scholarship Award,” revised by last year’s UEC, was in the possession of the FAC and Dean Bartanen.<sup>2</sup> The consensus amongst the committee was that it was worthwhile to reach out to Dean Bartanen and the FAC once more to reiterate the UEC’s endorsement of implementing such an award. Similarly to the sentiment of last year’s committee, this year’s UEC agreed that the FAC has a more comprehensive view of faculty scholarship and would be the appropriate body to identify awardees.

The UEC followed-through on reaching out to Dean Bartanen about this, and she responded positively, stating that the FAC plans to recommend a junior and a senior research award recipient for recognition at the Fall Faculty Dinner.

---

<sup>1</sup> The recipient is notified of this distinction in the form of a letter from the UEC. There is no money, as of yet, associated with this award. Though, the understanding is that eventually, there will be. The faculty members of the UEC choose the recipient from the yearly pool of received faculty research award proposals in accordance with the guidelines outlined in the provided award MOU.

<sup>2</sup> The document “Criteria for Faculty Scholarship Award” is attached to this report.

### **3. Investigate the feasibility and desirability of implementing three separate application deadlines for three separate funding periods.**

After consulting with faculty members in the sciences about the desirability of a third application deadline, the committee learned that there are indeed students who would benefit from a third, early deadline that is designed for research to be completed in the fall semester.<sup>3</sup>

It was also suggested by those faculty members consulted that the best time for a third, early deadline would be somewhere in the third week of the term.

The committee approved to implement a new deadline in the third week of the semester, effective fall 2015—the caveat being that the efficacy of the specified deadline could be reviewed after the first year of implementation.

### **4. Formalize and publicize rules for a streamlined application for UEC summer student research support.**

To gather more information about this topic, Sunil Kukreja and Dawn Padula met with Leslie Saucedo in the fall to talk about how to go about streamlining the UEC Student Research Award application to better facilitate those also applying for the Summer Research Grant in Science and Mathematics. The issue in the past has been that there is a quick turnaround between a student finding out the status of their Summer Research Grant proposal and then meeting the spring UEC deadline, if needed.<sup>4</sup> Streamlining would allow those applying to the latter to quickly and efficiently also apply to the UEC for support.

At that meeting, it was determined that the primary difference between the UEC application and the Summer Research Grant in Science and Mathematics application was the length (the application length is shorter in the former). The proposed solution would allow students applying to both to use the same application.

The UEC decided to add the following question to the UEC Student Research Award application in lieu of asking those applying for both for a new cover letter (as suggested by last year's committee):

“Have you submitted this exact proposal to the Summer Research Grant in Science and Mathematics? \_\_\_yes \_\_\_no”

---

<sup>3</sup> The established deadlines for student research are currently in November (typically for work to be completed in the spring semester) and in April (typically for work to be completed in the summer).

<sup>4</sup> Some students who receive Summer Research stipends often also then apply to the UEC to receive support for project supplies. Others may also apply for a UEC award if they did not receive a Summer Research grant.

It would be understood that those who answered “yes” could submit longer proposals to the UEC without penalty. The committee approved this change and the new question will be included in the applications effective fall 2015.<sup>5</sup>

**5. With respect to the work of the committee during 2014-2015, indicate in your end of year report whether the size of the committee was appropriate and identify any committee work that seemed superfluous.**

The consensus of the UEC is that none of the work is superfluous and that the size of the committee (seven faculty members, including a chair, two student members, and the Ex Officio member) was ideal.

In this discussion, it was noted that due to the growing number of student research award applications received every semester (there were 32 in the fall and 49 in the spring), that next year’s committee could try having all members read all of the applications for both faculty and student research—this is in lieu of breaking into faculty and student research subcommittees. This way, the workload of the smaller subcommittees would be divided more evenly, and that by having all members of the committee participate in all processes, the passing on of historical knowledge and precedence in terms of process from committee to committee would become more fluid.

As for the work of the committee on the whole, the UEC members all agree that work related to reading proposals and awarding money for support of faculty and student travel and research in both the fall and spring, granting the available Release Time Awards to faculty, selecting a Dirk Andrew Phibbs Award recipient and selecting a Register Lecturer is both valuable and essential work.

**OTHER NOTEWORTHY UEC ACTIVITY:**

**1. Proposal to the Budget Task Force**

In October, the UEC submitted a proposal to Dean Jackson, Dean Bartanen and the Budget Task Force for a total increase to the budget of \$50,000--\$35,000 of which would be added to the faculty travel budget, and \$15,000 of which would be added to the student research and travel budget.

**2. Addition to the Student Research Award Application Regarding IACUC Approval**

In the fall, UEC member Erin Colbert-White noted that while our current application for student research awards does ask students to indicate whether they have applied for IRB approval, if necessary, it does not ask if students have applied for IACUC (Institutional Animal Care and Use

---

<sup>5</sup> Point of information: Sunil Kukreja reached out to Leslie Saucedo this past spring, letting her know of the approved change, and informed her that the UEC would accept student research applications in the spring semester that were also used for the Summer Research Grant applications without further editing.

Committee) approval. Wording to this effect was created and then approved by Alyce DeMarais who oversees the university IACUC.

The committee approved to add the new verbiage to the existing application effective this past spring, 2015.

### **3. UEC Response to Memo Submitted from OT to the Senate and the Creation of a Standardized Rubric for Evaluation**

It is our understanding that our liaison, Maria Sampen, reported to the Senate about the content of a meeting with George Tomlin from OT on January 28, 2015. This meeting was in response to the OT faculty memo to the Senate dated December 23, 2014 in regard to UEC awarding practices. In addition, note that the minutes from our January 28, 2015 meeting also provide a clear overview of the conversation that took place between OT and the UEC.<sup>6</sup>

As a result of the conversation with OT, the UEC felt it beneficial to explore streamlining the process for determining student research awards by creating a standardized rubric extracted directly from the current published guidelines in the Student Research Award application. Such a rubric could further solidify the process, and would provide all current and future members of the committee a standardized form to use for evaluation.<sup>7</sup>

UEC Member Terry Beck devised a rubric for this purpose and brought it to the committee for review. After much discussion and fine-tuning, the approved rubric was tested this past April. Student research subcommittee members filled out the rubric and used the newly approved scoring system. They then provided additional feedback to help fine-tune the rubric further.

In the final meeting of the year, the UEC approved to adopt the rubric for the use of Student Research Award evaluations in the future noting that, in the fall, the committee could return to the rubric for further refinement, if needed. It was also noted that any wording in the rubric should be a direct reflection of the wording in the published guidelines. Due to this, the committee also approved to amend the printed application guidelines in the fall to directly reflect the wording used in the amended rubric so that both remain completely in line with one another.<sup>8</sup> The committee also discussed publishing the rubric once finalized.

---

<sup>6</sup> Point of information: Yvonne Swinth wrote another e-mail to Padula on March 24 asking for more information about changes to the published UEC guidelines ahead of the student research deadline and for specific feedback on fall OT applications not funded since those same students would be seeking retroactive funding. In the response, Padula reiterated that the UEC guidelines had not changed in any way and echoed the sentiment of the committee that the UEC is unable to provide individual feedback on applications. UEC Senate liaison, Maria Sampen, was sent a copy of this correspondence.

<sup>7</sup> Though no standardized/printed rubric had been used, it is important to note that everyone evaluating student research proposals to this point have been instructed to score them using an agreed-upon numeric system, and to base their evaluation upon the criteria outlined in the printed guidelines. The process also involves discussion of applications whose scores differentiate greatly from reader to reader. The process has always been objective, but the consensus of the committee is that a printed rubric and a revised scoring system would further streamline and solidify the process.

<sup>8</sup> The most recent version of the rubric is attached to this report.

#### **4. Discussion Surrounding UEC Funding of On-Line Public Access Publication Fees**

During our evaluation of faculty research proposals this year, it was noted that there were requests to cover fees for open-access on-line publications. After further discussion, the consensus was that this is a growing issue since open-access and online publications are becoming more prominent. Our current guidelines stipulate that the UEC will not cover "vanity press" publication charges, but there is not any established criteria published for handling these types of publication cost requests.

Discussion surrounded this issue, including potential ways of handling the issue in the future if necessary. The outcome of the discussion was that next year's UEC could perhaps determine the need for establishing a guideline to this effect and if one was deemed necessary, fleshing it out and publishing it.

#### **SUGGESTED SENATE CHARGES FOR NEXT YEAR'S COMMITTEE:**

##### **1. Create a standardized rubric for evaluation of Faculty Research Award applications and reflect any changed wording in the Faculty Research Award application itself.**

Such a rubric would mirror the newly-established and adopted rubric for evaluation of Student Research Award applications.

##### **2. Determine the need to establish a guideline for funding on-line public access publication fees.**

Please refer to Item #4 under the sub-category "Other Noteworthy UEC Activity" of this report. In addition, the minutes from the meeting on April 22, 2015 can provide further insight into the discussion on the topic thus far.

##### **In addition to Senate Charges, this year's committee requests that next year's committee:**

1. Utilize and revisit the attached rubric for evaluating Student Research Award applications for fine-tuning, remembering to reflect any wording changes in the published application.
2. Ask that all committee members read all applications for faculty and student research (in lieu of splitting into subcommittees), thus divvying up the work more equitably amongst members.
3. Consider adding the same IACUC wording added to the Student Research Award application this past year to the Faculty Research Award application if deemed necessary.

**CONCLUSION:**

The work of the committee this year was extremely focused and productive. In addition to handling the regular duties assigned (which included evaluating 71 student research proposals), this year's UEC also submitted a substantial proposal to the BTF for increased funds, handled all of the Senate charges for the year, hosted the Register Lecture, responded in a timely manner and comprehensively to a memo written to the Senate by OT questioning UEC Awarding practices, and created and established a rubric for standardization of Student Research Award applications.

It was both an honor and a pleasure to lead this dedicated group of faculty colleagues and students in supporting faculty and student scholarship, creativity and innovation.

Respectfully submitted,

Dawn Padula, DMA  
UEC Chair 2014-15  
Associate Professor  
Director of Vocal Studies  
School of Music

## APPENDIX I

### **Criteria for Faculty Scholarship Award<sup>9</sup>**

The following shall be used as selection criteria for the faculty scholarship award. The selection committee is encouraged (but not required) to consider departmental support for the scholarship as a means of differentiating relative merit.

- Quality of the nominee's scholarly or creative achievements, with emphasis on originality, imagination, and innovation.
- Scholarly work should be validated and communicated through peer review, such as: published articles (e.g., peer-reviewed journal articles, technical reports, book chapters, and essays) contributing to a body of knowledge; books (e.g., original works and textbooks, researched compilations, edited books); grant support (e.g., competitive, peer-reviewed research grants; foundation grants.) Extra weight should be associated with work that has been initiated and completed after the faculty member has started working at UPS.
- Creative work should be validated and communicated through peer review and scholarly critique, such as: production, exhibition, or performance of creative work (e.g., visual or performing art, or literature presented in the form of peer-reviewed publications, juried exhibits, noteworthy performances, readings or recordings, solo exhibits); commissioned or collected works (e.g., commissions for creative work; works collected by public and private museums and galleries); development of new technologies, materials, methods, or educational approaches (e.g., patents, inventions, new statistical techniques.) As with scholarly work, extra weight should be associated with work initiated and completed subsequent to joining the faculty at UPS.
- Impact on the nominee's discipline or field of study.
- Contributions to the university, profession, and wider community.
- National and/or international peer recognition of scholarly contributions.

---

<sup>9</sup> This was formulated by the 2013-2014 UEC.

**APPENDIX II**

Scoring Criteria for Student Research Awards  
UEC – University of Puget Sound

Name(s) \_\_\_\_\_  
Proposal Title: \_\_\_\_\_  
Amount Requested: \_\_\_\_\_ Total Score: \_\_\_\_\_

Assign a whole number score (e.g., 1, 2, 3) in each of the areas.

Student’s Background/Preparedness Score: \_\_\_\_\_

- 1 - Award proposal gives little evidence of writer’s preparation
- 3 – Award proposal provides evidence that the student is prepared
- 5 – Award proposal provides evidence that the student is exceedingly well prepared to conduct this research.

Research Purpose, Significance and Rationale Score: \_\_\_\_\_

- 1 – Research purpose lacks significance or the provided rationale is not directly related to the proposed research
- 3 – Research purpose is significant and the rationale is clearly related to the proposed research
- 5 – Research purpose is highly significant and likely to generate new knowledge in the field. The rationale is tightly focused on the proposed research.

Methods of Study Score: \_\_\_\_\_

- 1 – Study methods are not clearly defined or are inappropriate for this project, **or** their appropriateness to the stated purpose is not articulated.
- 3 – Study methods are defined and appropriate to the stated purpose.
- 5 – Study methods are sophisticated and directly address the project’s purpose.

Communicating Findings Score: \_\_\_\_\_

- 1 – Communication plan is vague
- 3 – Communication plan is specific, doable, and focused.

Budget Score: \_\_\_\_\_

- 1 – Budget expenses lack justification or fall outside of UEC guidelines
- 3 – Budget expenses are justified and fall inside UEC guidelines. For requests that exceed the \$500 UEC maximum, the proposal explicitly and convincingly notes how the applicant will complete the project if it is not fully funded.

Award requirements are met: \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No  
If no, please note the requirement(s) that has not be met (e.g., no IRB review).

Holistic Evaluation: \_\_\_\_\_ Do not fund \_\_\_\_\_ Fund if possible \_\_\_\_\_ Definitely Fund

Comments:

The IEC was charged with the following tasks for the 2014-2015 academic year (in bold). What was accomplished by the committee is indicated following each charge.

**Senate charges to the International Education Committee 2014-2015:**

**1. With respect to the issue of sexual violence,**

**a. Continue to develop a protocol for reviewing study abroad programs that do not collect or report information regarding sexual violence;**

**b. Determine how to manage programs that do not report having student support services and response protocols for student safety in place;**

In 2013-2014, the assessment process established by the IEC was to have the Office of International Programs collect the relevant information regarding sexual violence and include it in the approval and review process of international programs.

Providers, especially smaller providers have not responded to requests to provide information about their protocols. The OIS is putting together a spreadsheet of providers and their policies, or lack of policies. This is an ongoing process.

**c. Continue to assess the efficacy of safety information provided to students before they study abroad, including sexual violence support and reporting procedures for each study abroad program;**

**d. The efficacy of Puget Sound reporting and response processes should an incident of sexual violence occur.**

The University of Puget Sound, Study Abroad Pre-Departure Handout, was updated in October 2014. The OIP and Marta Palmquist-Cady met over the summer to develop this resource. A draft of the handout, "Sexual Harassment & Assault Abroad: Prevention & Seeking Assistance" is attached to this IEC Final Report. (Exhibit 1)

Associate Dean of Students and Director of Counseling, Health & Wellness Services, Donn Marshall, continues to work with the OIP to assess the efficacy of the study abroad pre-departure information on sexual assault prevention and the efficacy of the Puget Sound reporting and response processes should an incident of sexual violence occur.

The committee recommends that this charge be carried over to the next year.

**2. Continue to review the current list of study abroad programs and eliminate expensive programs that do not provide something distinctive (e.g., language, discipline, or geography.)**

**A. Hispanic Studies**

Hispanic Studies submitted a list of programs in Spanish-speaking countries to the IEC. The recommendation was that several programs be eliminated because Hispanic Studies does not allow credits earned in those programs to apply to their majors or minor and those programs do not have any significant programming that is not duplicated by a better program. On October 27, 2014, the IEC approved the elimination of the following programs:

## Semester Programs

- CIEE: Liberal Arts, Santiago Chile
- IES: Area and Language Studies, Quito, Ecuador
- IES: Direct Enrollment, Quito, Ecuador

## Summer Programs

- IFSA Butler: Summer Language & Culture at the Universidad de Buenos Aires, Buenos Aires, Argentina
- IES: Area and Language Studies, Barcelona, Spain
- IES: Intensive Internship, Barcelona, Spain
- Universidad de Valladolid, Valladolid, Spain

## B. Programs in the United Kingdom

Puget Sound had 18 programs in and around London. It was difficult to advise students as to the best program with so many options. The goal was to create a small list of approved options while at the same time meeting the needs of our students.

The IEC voted to keep the following programs in the UK:

- Queen Mary Direct Enrollment  
*This program offers a direct enrollment opportunity. Students have guaranteed housing on campus. Extensive courses are offered in many subject areas, so most students will be able to find the courses they need.*
- AHA International – London- Humanities Program  
*This meets the needs of students who want a liberal arts experience in London. It also provides an option for students who do not have a 3.0GPA as the GPA requirement is 2.5.*
- Arcadia-London-London Internship Program  
*This was the most rigorous internship program in London.*
- IES: London – Theater Studies Program  
*This program meets the specific needs of Theatre students wanting to study in London.*

The IEC voted to remove the following UK programs:

- IES: London, Study London Program
- IFSA Butler: London, Queen Mary
- IES: London, Direct Enrollment Queen Mary
- IFSA Butler: Lancaster, University of Lancaster
- IFSA Butler: London, University College London
- IFSA Butler: London, King's College
- AHA International, London, Internship Program
- IES: London, Direct Enrollment, City University
- IFSA Butler: London, School of Oriental & African Studies
- IFSA Butler: Oxford, University of Oxford
- IES: London, Direct Enrollment, Courtauld Institute of Art

- IES: London, Direct Enrollment, Mountview Academy of Theater Arts
- IES: London, Direct Enrollment, Slade School of Fine Art
- IES: London, Direct Enrollment, University College London

### C. Program Relocation and Expansion

The IEC approved the Madrid Summers Program at the University of Nebrija as a relocation and expansion of the Alcala Summer Internship Program. The Madrid Summers Program offers the following options:

- Internships in Business and Humanities in Spain
- Science Internships in Spain
- Hispanic Studies Summer Program
- Prospective Teachers of Spanish (K-12) Summer Program
- Foreign Language Graduation Requirement Program
- Independent Study Program Option

This is an ongoing charge to the IEC.

### **3. With respect to short-term study abroad programs,**

#### **a. Develop a template for proposing, organizing, and leading short-term study abroad programs.**

The IEC developed and approved the following documents:

- Faculty-Led Study Abroad Program Proposal
- Study Abroad Initiatives Development Grant

These will be included on the Faculty Professional Development Opportunities web page and in the University Resources for Faculty Professional Development 2015-2016 document. An announcement will also be sent out via faculty.coms.

Copies of these documents are appended to the IEC Final Report. (Exhibits 2 and 3)

### **4. Investigate and recommend ways to significantly increase the enrollment of international students on campus.**

**This is a self-charge from requested by the IEC in Fall 2014 and approved by the Senate.**

The IEC invited Elizabeth Orr, Assistant Director of Admission and International Admission Coordinator and Jenny Rickard, Vice-President of Admission, to speak at our meeting on Dec. 8, 2014. Admission is aware of the issue and is working on it. The IEC suggests that admission materials be provided to faculty who are working abroad so that they can help with recruiting and exchanges.

The best way for the IEC to contribute on this issue is to continue to develop exchange programs. Roy emphasized that departments needed to take ownership of specific programs and perhaps set up contacts with faculty. This is an ongoing process. The OIP met with representatives from the University of Essex, U.K. to discuss the viability of an exchange program. The OIP is moving forward on an exchange program with Koc University in Turkey. The University of Nebrija in Spain is a good option to be explored. OIP is examining possibilities in the Middle East and Africa for direct enrollment programs (CIEE Amman, Jordan and CIEE University of Botswana).

The committee anticipates that it will continue to work on this issue next year.

**5. Investigate reasons for the recent, dramatic decline in the number of Puget Sound students electing to study abroad, and how it might be abated.**

**This is a self-charge requested by the IEC in Fall 2014 and approved by the Senate.**

The IEC developed a "Study Abroad Decision Survey". This will be available on the OIP web page. A hard copy will also be available to advisors of freshmen and sophomore students as they consider the study abroad decision. A draft of the survey is shown in Exhibit 4.

The IEC has collected study abroad data from the Office of International Programs and the Office of Institutional Research. A copy is attached to this report. (Exhibit 5). The IEC has invited Dean Kris Bartanen to have a conversation with the committee on this issue. That meeting is scheduled for April 29, 2015.

The committee anticipates that it will continue to work on this issue next year.

**6. Work with the Office of Institutional Research to review and evaluate the returning questionnaire for study abroad students.**

The IEC requested a clarification from the Senate regarding whether it wanted a broader means of assessing effectiveness of the study abroad program via a sociological survey tool, or simply a revision of those few questions on the returning questionnaire that deal with the benefits of the experience. The response was to revise the survey.

The committee has had preliminary conversations about changes to the survey and recommends that this charge be carried over to the next year.

**7. With respect to the work of the committee during 2014-2015, indicate in the end-of-year report whether the size of the committee was appropriate and identify any committee work that seemed superfluous.**

The committee discussed whether its work could be accomplished with fewer faculty members. It concluded that it was beneficial to have representatives from different disciplines to address study abroad issues. It recommends that the size of the IEC remain the same but that some junior faculty members are appointed to the IEC so that they could become acquainted with university policy and financing issues regarding study abroad.

Over the year, the committee reviewed several student petitions and study abroad applications. Some of that work seemed superfluous. The committee recommends that it only needs to approve student petitions and study abroad applications to OIP for which there is a particular problem. Routine petitions and applications should be handled within OIP.

Respectfully submitted,

Gareth Barkin, Chair F14  
Alva Butcher, Chair S15

## Exhibit 1

# SEXUAL HARRASSMENT & ASSAULT ABROAD: PREVENTION & SEEKING ASSISTANCE

### Education and Prevention

- Learn about **cultural norms** in your host country. **Don't make assumptions** about dating, relationships, and social interactions. Instead, ask questions about gender related attitudes during your on-site orientation.
- Talk to local students. Learn about their experiences with dating and social interactions, and how these might differ from U.S. expectations.
- Learn about stereotypes of American students.
- Observe how the locals dress and act.
- **Know where not to go.** Ask your on-site staff or locals about which areas are riskier for American students.

### Strategies to Reduce Risk

- Travel and go out in a **group**. Tell others where you are going and how you are getting there.
- **Don't assume others understand your boundaries.** Locals may have a different concept of personal boundaries, or may not stop behaviors that lead to sexual violations unless you take definitive action.
- You are the safest when **sober!** Never leave drinks unattended. Date rape drugs are as common in other countries as in the U.S.
- Get a cell phone that works in your host country – make sure it is charged and has credit available. Carry emergency numbers with you.

### Personal Safety

- Don't be afraid to say **"No."** Don't worry about being rude. Your personal safety is most important.
- Tell your friends if you feel uncomfortable. Have a plan for what to do if this happens.
- Look out for your friends, and speak up if you are concerned.
- Pay attention to your internal voice that alerts you to danger.

### If you are a victim of sexual assault:

1. Seek a safe place immediately.
2. Call the emergency number for your program. They know the host country laws and resources best.
3. Try to record as many of the details as you can recall.
4. Consider seeking immediate medical attention. If you do so:
  - a. Do not shower or clean up
  - b. Keep clothes in paper bag, not plastic.
  - c. Do not brush hair.
  - d. Do not use the toilet.

- e. Do not brush teeth.
- f. Do not clean up the crime scene.
- g. If you think predator drugs were involved, get tested.

When receiving medical attention:

- h. Test for STI's (Sexually Transmitted Infections)
  - i. Look into emergency contraception (if available and legal in that country).
5. Contact program provider or U.S. Consulate for information on reporting laws in country. They will know if police systems in that country are supportive of victims of sexual assault.
    - a. Consider filing a police report - bring someone fluent in host country language with you to the police station.
  6. Seek follow-up counseling and support
    - a. Check with your program provider for resources in the area of your study abroad location
    - b. Talk to someone. Confide in a friend or counselor.
  7. Contact International Programs for additional support, or especially if you can't reach or get adequate support from Program Provider.
    - a. International Programs (253-879-2515)
    - b. Campus Security Services (after hours) 253-879-3311

### **How to help a victim:**

***Support survivors*** of violent crimes. No matter what they were wearing, whom they were with, where they were going—they did not ask to be harassed, raped, or assaulted.

- Do not downplay assault or harassment.
- Do not share or laugh at inappropriate jokes, comments, or stories about assault or harassment.

### **Campus Resources:**

[http://www.pugetsound.edu/files/resources/1585\\_Sexual%20Harassment%20and%20Sexual%20Assault%20Survival%20Guide.pdf](http://www.pugetsound.edu/files/resources/1585_Sexual%20Harassment%20and%20Sexual%20Assault%20Survival%20Guide.pdf)

[http://www.pugetsound.edu/files/resources/1584\\_Sexual%20Harassment%20and%20Sexual%20Assault%20Prevention%20Guide.pdf](http://www.pugetsound.edu/files/resources/1584_Sexual%20Harassment%20and%20Sexual%20Assault%20Prevention%20Guide.pdf)

\*This handout has been adapted from IES Abroad Educational Series: Sexual Assault Prevention, Evergreen College Study Abroad Handbook, and Puget Sound's Sexual Harassment and Sexual Assault Survival Guide.

## Exhibit 2

### Study Abroad Initiatives Development Grant

#### *Instructions for Applying*

The Study Abroad Initiatives Development Grants are to provide faculty with funds to help create new study abroad opportunities. Possible funding proposals:

- Site Visits - to assess the viability of a program location, organization or institution
- Program Shadowing – to accompany a faculty member currently leading a program abroad
- Faculty Visits – to meet with colleagues at other institutions to discuss new & collaborative program ideas
- Other ideas related to new study abroad program development

Proposals seeking other uses of the funds are also welcomed, but must be related to study abroad or international programs.

Faculty members seeking funding for study abroad initiatives are encouraged to contact Roy Robinson ([rrobinson@pugetsound.edu](mailto:rrobinson@pugetsound.edu)), Director, International Programs to discuss plans for new program development, site visits or other study abroad related initiatives.

#### **Deadlines: March 16 & October 1**

The amount of funds available to support new initiatives will not be determined each year until mid to late February. The maximum amount of available funds is \$50,000. Proposals seeking substantial funding from this \$50,000 should plan to meet the March 16 deadline. Remaining funds, if any, will be allocated to proposals received during the Oct 1 deadline and on an ad hoc basis after October 1, if funds are still available.

Faculty members interested in applying for a study abroad initiative development grant will need to submit:

1. A narrative of no longer than 3 pages which addresses the nature of the proposal
2. A budget explaining the need and use of the requested funds
3. A letter of support from the Department/Program Chair explaining how the study abroad program would fit into the curriculum
4. A sample itinerary
5. A tentative syllabus (the proposed course does not need to have already been approved)

The IEC Advisory Sub-committee (4 members of the IEC and the Director of International Programs) will evaluate all grant proposals. Following is a list of criteria used to evaluate the grant proposals:

- Sustainability – will this program run on an ongoing basis or will it only run one time
- Academic integration into the department's/program's/university's curriculum
- Strong structured opportunities for developing inter-cultural knowledge
- Strong departmental/program support
- Cost effectiveness
- Strong demonstrated need for the funds
- Commitment to Puget Sound's international goals
- Collaboration among multiple departments, programs or universities

**The completed application should be submitted to Roy Robinson, International Programs Director, CMB 1055, [rrobinson@pugetsound.edu](mailto:rrobinson@pugetsound.edu)**

**Sample Initiative:**

- Faculty member in Biology is working to create a new faculty-led study abroad program in tropical biology and submits a proposal seeking funding support to visit three possible university collaborators in Costa Rica and visit different sites for the proposed program.

## Exhibit 3

### Faculty-led Study Abroad Program Proposal

---

#### **Instructions:**

- All new study abroad programs and international activities, including non-credit based programs in which faculty or staff from the University of Puget Sound are bringing students out of the United States, must be proposed and approved in advance by the University of Puget Sound.
- New program proposals must be submitted a minimum of 12 months prior to the proposed program start date

Please submit the following to the Director of International Programs via email [rrobinson@pugetsound.edu](mailto:rrobinson@pugetsound.edu) or CMB 1055:

1. Answers to the questions below
2. A letter of support from your department/program chair
3. A course syllabus if applicable
4. A sample budget

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact the Office of International Programs (OIP).

Roy Robinson – [rrobinson@pugetsound.edu](mailto:rrobinson@pugetsound.edu) – ext. 3653

Allyson Lindsley – [alindsley@pugetsound.edu](mailto:alindsley@pugetsound.edu) ext. 2513

---

Name:

Department/Program:

Will program require a 2<sup>nd</sup> faculty member?

Alternate faculty member if needed:

#### **Program Info**

Program Name:

Proposed Program Location:

Proposed number of days/weeks/semester:

How often do you intend to run the program?

Have you run this program previously?

Host University/Organization:

Contact Name, Title, and Address:

Please describe on-site support:

Please describe student accommodations and meal arrangements for the program:

Primary means of transportation:

What is the availability of computer labs, internet access and use of libraries, if needed?

Please describe the accessibility of services for students with disabilities:

Please describe the on-site orientation:

Other relevant on-site information:

### **Administration**

Does your department/program fully support your proposal? Please attach a letter of support from your Department/Program Chair (REQUIRED):

Will other faculty members be willing to serve as subsequent program directors?

Are there other departments/programs that will co-sponsor or support the program?

Are other similar programs currently offered by Puget Sound?

### **Department/Program**

Proposed Course (s): (Department/program and number; units; instructor; prerequisites:

Please attach a course(s) syllabus:

How does this course(s) relate to the department/program?

What academic need does this program fill for the department/program/university?

How does this program complement current departmental/program offerings?

Explain the rationale for choosing the proposed location(s) and course(s). How do you expect the location(s) to influence your teaching and students' learning? How will the host culture be integrated into the syllabus and student experience?

What is your experience in the proposed location(s)?

### **Student Recruitment**

How many students do you plan to have participate in the program?

How will students be selected for the program?

What is the target student population?

Will this program (courses and location) appeal to the target population?

Are there enough students in the target population to meet the student recruitment needs?

How do you intend to promote the program?

### **Health/Safety/Security**

What are the potential safety and security risks and concerns?

How has the safety and security on the program been vetted?

What are possible health risks in the locations of travel?

What are the local health resources?

### **Estimated Program Budget**

Please attach an estimated program budget. Please contact the Director of International Programs for questions related to the budget.

The estimated budget should include

Airfare

Housing

Meals

Field Trips/excursions

Local Transportation

Visa/departure fees

Immunizations/Needed medicine

Course Materials

Other

**Other**

Is there any additional information you would like the committee to consider regarding your proposal?

## Exhibit 4

### Study Abroad Decision Survey [DRAFT]

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. Your answers are anonymous, and will help us better understand why students choose not to study abroad.

1. What is your primary major? [PULL-DOWN]
2. If you have a second major, what is it? [PULL-DOWN]
3. In your own words, please tell us why you opted not to study abroad. [OPEN-ENDED]
4. Do you plan to pursue study abroad in the future? [Y/N/DK, OPEN-ENDED COMMENT]
5. Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about why you chose not to study abroad. [SA/A/N/D/SD/(N/A)]
  - a. I did not feel ready to study abroad.
  - b. I had personal (e.g., family, friends, health) reasons for not going.
  - c. I will fall behind in my Puget Sound degree if I study abroad.
  - d. Course credit will not transfer to Puget Sound as I expected.
  - e. My financial situation changed.
  - f. I was not able to apply enough of my financial aid to study abroad.
  - g. I became dissatisfied with the program I'd chosen.
  - h. I was not accepted by the program to which I applied.
  - i. I missed the application deadline.
  - j. I had difficulty with the visa process.
  - k. Other, please specify:
6. Of the reasons in Question 5, which were most significant to your decision? (Rank up to three)
  - a. [PULL-DOWN LIST OF ITEMS FROM Q5]
  - b. [PULL-DOWN LIST OF ITEMS FROM Q5]
  - c. [PULL-DOWN LIST OF ITEMS FROM Q5]
7. Which of the following steps toward applying did you take? Check all that apply.
  - a. Attended a study abroad information session
  - b. Met with someone in the Office of International Programs
  - c. Met with someone in Student Financial Services
  - d. Requested information from the Office of the Registrar about transfer credit.
  - e. Filled out an application
  - f. Attended a pre-departure session
8. We welcome additional comments about your study abroad decision. [OPEN-ENDED]

**Exhibit 5**

**Study Abroad Data from the Office of International Programs**

*Number of students studying abroad as a percentage of their freshman class*

<b>2008-09</b>	<b>2009-10</b>	<b>2010-11</b>	<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>	<b>2014-15</b>
37.5%	33.5%	35.4%	32%	32.2%	28.6%	23.6%

These numbers do not include faculty led programs such as Pac Rim.

*Number of Juniors studying abroad as a percentage of the Junior Official Fall Enrollment*

<b>2008-09</b>	<b>2009-10</b>	<b>2010-11</b>	<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>	<b>2014-15</b>
40.5%	36.4%	36.2%	35.7%	32.7%	29.6%	25.0%

These numbers do not include faculty led programs such as Pac Rim.

**Study Abroad Data from the Office of Institutional Research**

*Percentage of students in each graduating class who have earned credit for study abroad*

<b>2008-09</b>	<b>2009-10</b>	<b>2010-11</b>	<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>
38.8%	42.5%	36.2%	36.8%	33.7%	34.4%

These numbers include faculty led programs.

**Remaining Funds from the Study Abroad Instructional Budget**

	<b>2013-2014</b>	<b>Projected 2014-2015</b>
Study Abroad Instructional Budget	\$3,137,000	\$3,137,000
Program Costs	\$2,908,266	\$2,272,447
Remaining Funds	\$ 228,734	\$ 864,553

## **Student Life Committee: End of Year Report 2014-15**

The 2014-15 Student Life Committee (“SLC”) met throughout the fall and spring terms, most often on a bi-weekly schedule. The members of the committee this year were (as of Spring 2015):

Brad Reich (faculty member, Chair)  
David Latimer (faculty member)  
Deidre McNally (student member)  
Eli Gandour-Rood (Library liaison)  
Lisa Ferrari (Associate Academic Dean)  
Mike Benveniste (faculty member)  
Mike Segawa (Dean of Students)  
Poppy Fry (faculty member)  
Rachel Askew (student member)  
Sam Jenkins (student member)  
Jennifer Neighbors (faculty member)  
Lisa Wood (faculty member)  
Nila Wiese (Senate liaison)

The 2014-15 SLC had two primary responsibilities:

1. Individual members staff the Integrity Board, Honor Court, and Sexual Misconduct Board hearings as needed (“Board Staffing”); and
2. Address the charges set by the Senate.

### **Board Staffing:**

According to Krystle Cobain, the Coordinator of Board Staffing, SLC members served on six different boards over the course of this academic year. We do not know how this number relates to past service, or what the need is likely to be in the future. It appears this responsibility began in academic year 2012-13, so there might be separate data available should the Senate have questions.

There was some discussion, throughout the course of the year, that this staffing piece may not be equal among committee members for several reasons: member schedules affect actual availability, preparation and service time varies by Board/issues, and subject matter expertise requirements may limit the number of viable service providers. This “service equality” is something the Senate, in consultation with appropriate offices and resources, should consider in the future.

## **Faculty Senate Charges for the Student Life Committee**

The following charges came to the SLC in two pieces. Charges 1-5 arrived at the beginning of academic year 2014-15. Charge 6 came from the Senate in March of 2015. To the extent practically possible, members of the SLC addressed the charges simultaneously and often in inter-related fashions. Accordingly, there was some overlap between charges, and parameters of individual charges evolved over time. The charges are listed collectively, then discussed individually.

Charge 1 - Identify initiatives to increase faculty awareness regarding sexual assault issues on campus and faculty's reporting obligations.

Charge 2 - Appoint a Student Life Committee member to serve on the Sexual and Gender Violence Committee (SGVC). The SLC faculty representative to the SGVC will report back to the full Student Life Committee with any specific recommendations of relevance to the faculty.

Charge 3 - To identify initiatives or mechanisms for enriching (1) the academic component integrated into the first year experience (e.g. Prelude): and (2) the intellectual life on campus (i.e., outside the classroom).

Charge 4 - Conduct a self-evaluation of the SLC's standing charges and current responsibilities, and make recommendations to the Faculty Senate for changes that would enhance the efficiency and relevance of the work conducted by the committee (including ASUPS liaison functions and other advisory roles).

Charge 5 - With respect to the work of the committee during 2014-15, indicate in your end of year report whether the size of the committee was appropriate and identify and work that seemed superfluous.

Charge 6 (added March, 2015) - The Faculty Senate requests that the Student Life Committee in the 2014-2015 Academic Year investigate the principles, policies, and practices that guide decision-makers institutional as well as individual in determining 1) what sorts of expressions or activities lie within protected "freedom of expression;" 2) what sorts of expressions or activities fall outside protected "freedom of expression;" and 3) what sorts of expressions or activities "straddle" protected "freedom of expression."

**Charge 1:** Identify initiatives to increase faculty awareness regarding sexual assault issues on campus and faculty's reporting obligations.

In carrying out this charge, the working group focused first upon the initiatives to raise student awareness of sexual assault; this work is complete. The efforts centered on raising staff and faculty awareness are ongoing.

### Student awareness

First, the group examined the web-based and print resources available for students. The university's web-based resources are exhaustive if a bit labyrinthine. The main portal appears under the Title IX arm of the Diversity page:

<http://www.pugetsound.edu/about/diversity-at-puget-sound/title-ix/> . It contains information for aiding victims in reporting sexual assault as well as contact information for survivor support groups. Steps for reporting assault are clearly outlined including links to community resources (e.g., the Sexual Assault Center of Pierce County, Tacoma General). Two print pamphlets, "Sexual Harassment and Sexual Assault Survival Guide" and "Sexual Harassment and Sexual Assault Prevention Guide", more concisely summarize this web-based information.

The group met with Marta Palmquist-Cady, Assistant Dean of Students, to learn about sexual assault awareness initiatives promoted by the Dean of Students office and student groups. Marta outlined the semester's activities related to sexual assault awareness. There have been about two to three events per semester. First-year orientation involved a consent workshop and Green Dot talk in August. Later in the semester, there were several Green Dot training programs and other events like Take Back the Night. I've attached the summary from Marta (not attached to this report). As for student groups, Marta said that Peer Allies, SIRGE, and the Green Dot program are currently the most active relevant groups on campus.

The working group expressed to Marta our desire to provide a means by which victims of sexual assault might more easily access the relevant web-based information. The group suggested placing in all campus bathrooms posters with QR codes linked to the university's "Reporting Harassment or Sexual Assault" page. Marta agreed with the idea and showed [us] Whitman College's solution to this problem. Administrators at Whitman have printed two-sided...cards containing information for victims of sexual assault. The cards provide college and community contact information as well as QR codes linking the college's Green Dot program and Online Complainant Report form; a copy of one of these cards is attached. Plastic sleeves containing these cards are affixed to the backs of all bathroom stall doors throughout the college.

**Recommended action:** The Student Life Committee endorses the printing and distribution of information cards analogous to those produced by Whitman College. We recommend to the Dean of Students that funds be allocated for this purpose.

### Faculty and Staff Awareness

The group met with Nancy Nieraeth on December 3, 2014, to discuss initiatives directed toward the staff to raise awareness about sexual assault issues and reporting obligations. Nierath has been working with Michael Benitez to identify an effective web-based training module for the staff. Staff must complete the training module every two years. Additionally, Nieraeth planned several professional development sessions in January of 2015. Since this discussion, the web-based

training session has been rolled out for the staff, and four professional development sessions, led by Michael Benitez and Marta Palmquist-Cady, were held in January of 2015.

The group met with Michael Benitez on December 4, 2014, to discuss initiatives directed toward faculty to raise awareness about sexual assault issues and reporting obligations. As stated above, Benitez and Nieraeth worked together to find a much improved web-based training module on discriminatory harassment and sexual assault prevention. Benitez stressed the importance for full faculty participation in the training and was considering different ways to enforce full participation (e.g., tying the training to the faculty evaluation process, or linking it to salary raises). Benitez also suggested a creative way that the university faculty might support sexual/gender violence awareness – they could make a video similar to the one produced by ASUPS and BHERT ([https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=I-P-NwGH\\_5c#t=14](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=I-P-NwGH_5c#t=14)) as part of the Wyatt Desk Bias Awareness and Action Initiative. Since the meeting, the web-based module has been rolled out.

Several members of the SLC thought that it would be useful to ascertain the faculty's current awareness of local sexual assault issues and its understanding of university policies. Rather than gather anecdotes from the listserv, the working group requested that Dean Kris Bartanen ask department chairs to solicit this feedback from department chairs. Namely, the SLC was interested in:

- (i) What knowledge do faculty have of sexual assaults involving students on campus? Does this knowledge come from an alleged victim, alleged perpetrator, a sexual assault board, or is it hearsay?
- (ii) What would faculty like to know about the issue of sexual assault as it pertains to UPS?
- (iii) Are there any changes in practices that the faculty would like to see with respect to the issue?
- (iv) What is the faculty's sense of the severity of the problem on campus?

Bartanen declined the request but suggested that we might use the campus climate survey as a means to gather this information. Members of the SLC felt that the campus climate survey was not an effective way to gather the kind of information it sought, so the matter was not pursued.

**Charge 2:** Appoint a Student Life Committee member to serve on the Sexual and Gender Violence Committee (SGVC). The SLC faculty representative to the SGVC will report back to the full Student Life Committee with any specific recommendations of relevance to the faculty.

In addition to volunteering to serve as our committee secretary on most occasions, Prof. Poppy Fry also served as our sole representative for this charge. She provides the following:

*In the fall semester I began making connections with the Sexual and Gender Violence Committee and with other organizations and individuals dealing with sexual violence on campus. I met with Marta Palmquist-Cady and she briefed me on the current initiatives. I also attended SGVC meetings and joined the policy and procedure subcommittee. I attended one of the student speak-ups sponsored by the SGVC. In addition, I served on Sexual Misconduct Boards, which allowed me to see Puget Sound's conduct process in action and to better understand the context of the SGVC. I met repeatedly with Sarah Shives and Krystle Cobian regarding both the specific cases and the broader questions around adjudicating sexual assault on campus.*

*I continued as a member of the SGVC and a member of the policy and procedure subcommittee [through the remainder of the academic year]. In the latter capacity, I helped formulate a timeline and plan for procedure changes and for bringing potential policy changes to faculty, staff, and the board of trustees. I met with Alisa Kessel, who has been formulating a new model for faculty engagement with issues of sexual assault. In May I will undergo Title IX investigator training to more thoroughly prepare for further Sexual Misconduct Boards and to convey the process to the faculty via the SLC.*

**Procedural Note:** Charges 1 and 2 are discussed above. Charges 3-6 will be discussed below, but the key to understanding SLC actions regarding those charges is the Motion to Revise SLC Procedures. We provide that Motion now, immediately followed by the remaining charges and attendant committee actions.

### **Motion to Revise SLC Procedures<sup>1</sup>**

#### **Rationale:**

As a major part of its work this year, SLC members have served in a liaison capacity to one or more ad hoc groups addressing current issues related to student life, serving primarily as conduits for information between committees and the Senate. It makes sense to consider a larger role for the SLC in ad-hoc committees that are working to implement new programming and policy related to student life.

---

<sup>1</sup> M/S/P March 9, 2015, amended April 21, 2015 (M/S/P, unanimously).

We propose the following five-part motion:

1. Procedures for the SLC will be revised so that members will participate more fully in ad hoc campus committees or special projects related to student life. In this way, faculty serving on the SLC will be able to weigh in directly on current issues and planning.
2. In parallel with these proposed modifications, student, administrative, and staff members of the SLC will be assigned to work on projects and committees along with faculty.
3. Members of the SLC would retain the right to initiate projects in the absence of current ad hoc committee work or special projects identified by the Faculty Senate in their charges.
4. The Faculty Senate would continue to direct charges to, and discuss progress with the committee as needed. Procedures for implementing Senate charges (in relation to the use of SLC faculty on other committees/working groups) will be modified through a consultative process between the Dean of Students, Chair of the SLC, Faculty Senate liaison, and other individuals if necessary. The SLC will also make recommendations about future charges through regular communication with the Senate Liaison as part of its work during the course of the academic year.
5. The following procedural issues and questions require further clarification. It is expected that these questions will be addressed during the course of the next year as this model is piloted.
  - a. How faculty, students, & staff will be selected for the SLC if their participation will also entail work on other student life committees or projects. Will there need to be any changes in that process?
  - b. How will workload issues be addressed in the future, given SLC members' additional participation on other committees or working groups? How will issues of balance and fairness be monitored and adjusted if necessary?
  - c. How will the work of the whole committee change (number of meetings, role of the chair, individual reporting responsibilities re: liaison work) as a result of this shift in responsibilities for members?
  - d. Will there be a need for additional administrative support for committee members with this model in place (e.g. secretarial support, having staff support in meetings for note-taking, or copying and distributing documents)?

**Charge 3:** To identify initiatives or mechanisms for enriching (1) the academic component integrated into the first year experience (e.g. Prelude): and (2) the intellectual life on campus (i.e., outside the classroom).

The SLC discussed the feasibility of Charge 3, particularly during the Spring of 2015. Those in attendance agreed that a) in light of other groups on campus, this Charge was redundant, at least in part(s)<sup>2</sup>, and b) the totality of this Charge could more effectively be carried out under then pending (within the SLC) Motion to Revise SLC Procedures.

After the Motion to Revise SLC Procedures was approved by the SLC, a motion was M/S/P that working group 3 disband, while still maintaining the committee's commitment to the first year experience and intellectual life on campus.

**Charge 4:** Conduct a self-evaluation of the SLC's standing charges and current responsibilities, and make recommendations to the Faculty Senate for changes that would enhance the efficiency and relevance of the work conducted by the committee (including ASUPS liaison functions and other advisory roles).

Working group 4 presented the original Motion to Revise SLC Procedures. It passed unanimously.

**Charge 5:** With respect to the work of the committee during 2014-15, indicate in your end of year report whether the size of the committee was appropriate and identify and work that seemed superfluous.

There are two components to this response and they largely depend on Senate action regarding the Motion to Revise SLC Procedures.

First, if the SLC remains "as is", we do not have a concrete response to the size issue. Our committee has approximately 12 members, several with different forms of standing or designation. 100% attendance, at SLC meetings, was extremely rare. Extremely. Accordingly it is unclear if we should have more members, with the expectation that only a percentage will be at any given meeting, or if there is another avenue or mechanism to facilitate better attendance.

Second, if the Motion is adopted as set forth, we will not understand true staffing needs for some period of time, as this will constitute a brand new undertaking. We see no reason committee size would change now, but lack sufficient evidence to predict future needs or trends.

**Charge 6:** The Faculty Senate requests that the Student Life Committee in the 2014-2015 Academic Year investigate the principles, policies, and practices that guide

---

<sup>2</sup> At the time this was discussed, there was also an existing Prelude Committee and a First Year Experience Task Force.

decision-makers institutional as well as individual in determining 1) what sorts of expressions or activities lie within protected “freedom of expression;” 2) what sorts of expressions or activities fall outside protected “freedom of expression;” and 3) what sorts of expressions or activities “straddle” protected “freedom of expression.”

Charge 6 came to the SLC fairly late in the year. However, it provides an excellent vehicle for discussing the proposed Motion to Revise SLC Procedures. The fundamental purpose of the Motion is to more efficiently carry out the SLC’s role as specified in the By-Laws (in pertinent part):

*To act as a liaison on student life issues among students, staff, faculty, and the administration. This includes providing input on various Student Affairs projects and initiatives as brought to the Committee by the Dean of Students....<sup>3</sup>*

To the best of SLC knowledge, the Senate sent this charge to the SLC, PSC, and Diversity Committee/BHERT simultaneously, and without specified sequencing. The PSC conducted initial analysis of the Faculty Code, identifying three areas for future discussion. It then passed this information onto the SLC, who had also begun work on the charge. It quickly became obvious, in light of both substantive and procedural concerns, that an ad hoc committee was required because this, like many student life issues, involved multiple parties in the campus community. The SLC then drafted a motion<sup>4</sup> regarding that ad hoc committee. Pursuant to that motion, and in conjunction with the Dean of Students, an ad hoc committee would be formed comprised of: three members of the SLC (including one student member), two members of BHERT, two members of PSC, one member of library staff, and the Dean and or his/her designee. Charge 6 provides practical context for the Motion to Revise SLC Procedures as this is the type of model and interaction the SLC recognizes, and foresees, as commonplace in student life issues at Puget Sound. To be clear, this is not a Motion to change traditional charging authority; it is a motion to modify implementation of charges addressed by the SLC.

## **Conclusion**

The SLC worked diligently this year, not only in terms of the assigned Charges and Board Staffing responsibilities, but to genuinely examine the past actions, current challenges, and future needs of a Senate committee focusing on student life. This year actually built on discussions beginning in 2013-14, so we did not reach our conclusions and recommendations quickly or lightly. We strongly urge the Senate to approve the Motion to Revise SLC Procedures and we look forward to working, across campus, to better address student life issues.

---

<sup>3</sup> Faculty By-Laws 2014-15.

<sup>4</sup> The motion is pending (internally with the SLC) as it directly relies on the Senate’s action regarding the also pending Motion to Revise SLC Procedures.

Respectfully submitted,

Brad Reich  
Chair, Student Life Committee 2014-15

The Faculty Senate charge the Professional Standards and Student Life Committees to collaboratively work with the Bias-Hate Education Response Team to: 1) investigate existing University policies pertaining to the display of materials for campus/public consumption, 2) make recommendations for changes or additions to the existing University policies including the possibility of a statement regarding freedom of expression, and 3) consider revision or clarification of the procedures for “immediate response” to reported incidences of Bias-Hate (“Response Protocol of Bias-Hate Incidents,” Section V.B.1.).

Note, the following is the existing statement on freedom of expression contained within the “Response Protocol of Bias-Hate Incidents.”

(<http://www.pugetsound.edu/files/resources/communicationresponse-protocolfor-biashate-inciden.pdf>)

“As a fundamental commitment and as part of the progress we envision, the Puget Sound community protects academic freedom, the open exchange of ideas and creative, intellectual expression. Freedom of expression on this campus means equally that we shall not seek to limit individuals’ First Amendment right to express their views and that we shall reject conduct that hinders in any way the right of all to pursue their educational goals in a safe and respectful environment. We understand that these freedoms and rights do not permit us to tolerate speech, symbols, or other actions that are wounding or threaten harm to specific individuals or groups because destructive hostility has no place in open and honest learning” (“Response Protocol of Bias-Hate Incidents,” p. 1).

**Committee on Diversity  
2014-2015 Annual Report to the Faculty Senate**

**Committee on Diversity Members**

Michael Benitez (Chief Diversity Officer, Dean of Diversity and Inclusion), Chad Gunderson, Nakisha Renee Jones (student member), Aislinn Melchior, Heidi Orloff, Czarina Ramsay (Director for Intercultural Engagement), Oriell Siu, George Tomlin (chair), Mike Valentine, Carolyn Weisz

**Senate Liaison:** William Beardsley

**Prepared by:** George Tomlin, Chair, with input from CoD Members

**Submitted:** April 30, 2015

**Committee Duties and Activities**

Duties per Faculty Bylaws (1-8) and Senate Charges (C1-C6)	Committee Activities												
1. To serve the university's goal of increasing the social diversity of the campus.	--See numbers 2-8 below.												
2. To participate in the development of initiatives that enable the university to hire new faculty from historically under-represented populations and to support better the retention and success of such faculty.	<p>--Hiring and Retention Data (Tenure Line) Each year the Committee on Diversity reviews hiring and retention data for tenure line faculty in relation to sex and race (the only social diversity categories that the University systematically documents for faculty). In any one year the rates can be volatile due to the small numbers. Accumulating data over many years addresses that limitation, but can mask trends. With these stipulations, the CoD reports the following.</p> <p>Rates of hiring (AY0506 through AY1415) and retention (AY0506 through AY1314) are nearly equal according to sex, but differ for retention according to race.</p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;">Hiring Rate (Tenure Line)</td> <td style="width: 50%;">Retention (Tenure Line)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Women: 52% (47/91)</td> <td>Women: 86% (37/43)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Men: 48% (44/91)</td> <td>Men: 88% (36/41)</td> </tr> </table> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;">Hiring (Tenure Line)</td> <td style="width: 50%;">Retention (Tenure Line)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Faculty of Color: 20% (18/91)</td> <td>Faculty of Color: 69% (11/16)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>White Faculty: 80% (73/91)</td> <td>White Faculty: 91% (62/68)</td> </tr> </table> <p>A chi-square analysis of the differences in retention by race suggests that the lower rate of retention of faculty of color is unlikely to have occurred by chance, in a world where equal rates of retention are assumed, <math>X^2(1, N = 84) = 5.726, p &lt; .02</math>. One can be 98% confident in this</p>	Hiring Rate (Tenure Line)	Retention (Tenure Line)	Women: 52% (47/91)	Women: 86% (37/43)	Men: 48% (44/91)	Men: 88% (36/41)	Hiring (Tenure Line)	Retention (Tenure Line)	Faculty of Color: 20% (18/91)	Faculty of Color: 69% (11/16)	White Faculty: 80% (73/91)	White Faculty: 91% (62/68)
Hiring Rate (Tenure Line)	Retention (Tenure Line)												
Women: 52% (47/91)	Women: 86% (37/43)												
Men: 48% (44/91)	Men: 88% (36/41)												
Hiring (Tenure Line)	Retention (Tenure Line)												
Faculty of Color: 20% (18/91)	Faculty of Color: 69% (11/16)												
White Faculty: 80% (73/91)	White Faculty: 91% (62/68)												

	<p>statement.</p> <p>--Hiring Data (Visiting Faculty)  Data from visiting faculty hires for fall 2012-fall 2014 were provided this year by the Office of Institutional Research. Omitting the 7% who choose not to report race/ethnicity, the rates of minority hiring F12 to F14 have been 17.8%, 8.6%, and 23.7%, respectively (3-year rate 16.9%). Removing international faculty they are 15.9%, 5.9%, and 14.7%, respectively (3-year rate 12.5%).</p> <p>From faculty composition data provided by the Academic Vice President:</p> <table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Tenure Line Faculty</th> <th>Full-Time Faculty</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Self ID: white</td> <td>89.36% (168)</td> <td>86.45% (217)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Of color</td> <td>10.64% (20)</td> <td>13.55% (34)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Subtracting the tenure line numbers from the full-time numbers to arrive at the visiting faculty composition yields 14 of 63 as faculty of color, or 22.2%.</p> <p>Combined with the recent hiring rates for tenure track faculty of color (28.6% last year, 50% current year), it can be concluded that the university is making some progress toward increasing the proportion of under-represented groups among the tenure line faculty. We are holding close or slightly slipping for visiting faculty. Obviously, to realize the long-term gains an increase represents, the hiring trend among tenure line faculty needs to continue. The current differential retention rate, if continued, would work to decelerate the long-term hiring trend toward a sustained representative faculty.</p> <p>--Diversity Liaison  As a result of a recommendation made by the CoD in 2011, departments conducting faculty searches are asked to appoint a Diversity Liaison. Percent of departments conducting tenure line searches that designated a diversity liaison follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>85.7% in AY 2014-2015</li> <li>100% in AY 2013-2014</li> <li>100% in AY 2012-2013</li> </ul>		Tenure Line Faculty	Full-Time Faculty	Self ID: white	89.36% (168)	86.45% (217)	Of color	10.64% (20)	13.55% (34)
	Tenure Line Faculty	Full-Time Faculty								
Self ID: white	89.36% (168)	86.45% (217)								
Of color	10.64% (20)	13.55% (34)								
<p>3. To work with the President, Vice-Presidents, and the Chief Diversity Officer concerning diversity</p>	<p>--Chad Gunderson and Carolyn Weisz served as the CoD representatives to the Diversity Advisory Council (DAC). The CoD sent two faculty this year at the request of CDO</p>									

<p>initiatives that can benefit from faculty presence and leadership, as needed.</p>	<p>Michael Benitez, because DAC was working on a new campus Diversity Strategic Plan and needed more faculty representation on its four subcommittees.</p> <p>--Michael Valentine served as the CoD representative to the Bias-Hate Education Response Team (BHERT).</p> <p>--The CoD worked collaboratively with the Academic Vice President and the Associate Dean to obtain and review hiring and retention data (see Duty #2 above).</p>
<p>4. To establish liaisons with key university units including staff and student diversity groups to assess strategic needs and work collaboratively in diversity-related initiatives, as needed.</p>	<p>-- The CoD collaborates with and works to support the work of DAC, BHERT, the Sexual and Gender Violence Committee (SGVC), the Chief Diversity Officer (CDO), and the Director for Intercultural Engagement.</p>
<p>5. To work with colleagues to maintain an educational environment that welcomes and supports diversity even as it protects and assures the rights of academic freedom outlined in the Faculty Code.</p>	<p>--See Duty 3.</p> <p>--The CoD began a preliminary review of the issue of conflicting wording about academic freedom between the Faculty Code and the response protocol of BHERT, at the request of the Faculty Senate. The CoD discussed the memo issued by the PSC on this topic (email memo of March 24, 2015 from MacBain to Tomlin, Reich, and Buescher). Because the CoD believes an important distinction was over-looked by the PSC between harm experienced by members of systemically advantaged versus systematically disadvantaged groups (CoD minutes of April 8, 2015), the CoD recommends that a meeting be convened in the fall among representatives of the PSC, the CoD, BHERT, and the Student Life Committee to exchange views and agree on a process of decision-making to resolve the seeming conflict of wording.</p>
<p>6. To activate annually a group of faculty, staff and students that will review aggregate data about patterns of bias and hate in our campus community with the purpose of creating educational opportunities for reflection and dialogue.</p>	<p>-- To enact this charge, each Fall the CoD normally appoints two of its members to serve on BHERT. At the request of the CDO (CoD Minutes, 11 Sept 2014), one BHERT faculty representative was shifted to sitting on the DAC. Mike Valentine served this year as the CoD representative on BHERT. The CoD was informed that there were 48 reports of confirmed bias this year, and 9 sexual misconduct reports.</p>
<p>7. To report annually to the Faculty Senate on the committee's work related to diversity goals 1-6.</p>	<p>--This document is our annual report.</p>
<p>8. Such other duties as may be assigned to it by the Faculty Senate.</p>	<p>--See Charges 1-6 below.</p>

<p>C1. Review department responses to Question 6 written during five-year curriculum assessments during 2014-15 in order to evaluate how well the new language elicits useful information on diversity in the curriculum. Propose feedback to the Curriculum Committee regarding Question 6.</p> <p>C2. By the end of spring semester provide to the Faculty Senate and the Curriculum Committee an analysis of the distribution of approved KNOW courses among departments, disciplines, and cores. If there appears to be an insufficiency of KNOW courses based on the target goal for the first year, informally encourage colleagues, in collaboration with the Office of the Associate Deans, to submit KNOW proposals.</p> <p>C3. Make recommendations to support better the work of the diversity liaisons for hiring based on assessment of feedback solicited last year (from search chairs and diversity liaisons for hiring) as well as from 2014-15 interviews with faculty of color about their hiring and retention experiences.</p>	<p>--Charge 1: The CoD collected department responses to Question 6 of the Curriculum Reviews of the past few years from the Associate Deans office, which had collated them. The review and analysis has begun and will continue next year, when a more meaningful comparison can be made with more recent data.</p> <p>--Charge 2: The CoD received the list of KNOW courses approved by the Curriculum Committee in AY1415. The CoD noted the lack of lower division courses and science courses among those approved for KNOW status. CoD members have participated in the KNOW Burlington planning group.</p> <p>--Charge 3: The CoD discussed with the CDO the role, history, and outcomes of the Diversity Liaison program. CoD members did not undertake interviews of recent faculty of color hires about their experiences, deterred by confidentiality concerns. The CoD also considered the work of similar faculty on other campuses, and came to the following recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) that the Faculty Search Diversity Liaison not be the search chair;</li> <li>(b) that the Faculty Search Diversity Liaison could be a non-voting member of the search committee from outside the department conducting the search;</li> <li>(c) that the university establish and train a pool of Faculty Search Diversity Liaisons to draw from for searches, to provide departments flexibility as to how the role is filled;</li> <li>(d) that the Faculty Search Diversity Liaison should connect with the CDO to discuss search criteria prior to position posting;</li> <li>(e) that diversity liaison service be recognized as university service.</li> </ul>
---	--

<p>C4. Review hiring and retention data by gender, race/ethnicity, their intersections, and any other categories to see if the data might be disaggregated in more revealing ways.</p>	<p>--Charge 4. The chair of the CoD met with the Academic Vice President and the Associate Dean responsible for hiring visiting faculty. Updated data were obtained on hiring and retention with the finest grain possible given the current data collection protocols. See duty #2 above. The CoD recommends that such data automatically be collated each year by the Office for Institutional Research, in a format that allows for meaningful analysis of cumulative trends, including the tracking of numbers for members of specific racial/ethnic groups. The tenure track hiring data were enhanced this year by the addition of information about the minority/majority status in the original applicant pools, which was very helpful in gaining a more complete picture of campus progress in hiring more faculty from under-represented groups.</p>
<p>C5. Appoint a CoD faculty member to serve on the Sexual and Gender Violence Committee (SGVC) and with that group assess the advisability of expanding the number of faculty Harassment Reporting Officers (HROs). The CoD faculty representative to the SGVC shall report back to the full CoD with any specific recommendations of relevance to the faculty.</p>	<p>--Charge 5. Aislinn Melchior was appointed by the CoD to serve on the SGVC. She participated in all its pertinent deliberations and reported back to the full CoD on the improvements coming to the accessibility of procedures to campus community members who feel they have been wronged, and to the processing procedures once a complaint has been made. As the SGVC work will continue AY1516, the CoD expects to also continue its representation on that committee.</p>
<p>C6. With respect to the work of the committee during 2014-15, indicate in the end-of -year report whether the size of the committee was appropriate and identify any committee work that seemed superfluous.</p>	<p>--Charge 6. The CoD had an extensive discussion at its meeting of 29 April 2015 as to its role, purpose, and size. Unlike many other standing committees, the CoD sends working representatives to several other groups (BHERT, DAC, SGVC). These representatives constituted a majority of faculty members on the CoD. Those remaining were too few to implement fully all the AY1415 charges to the CoD, despite having considerable help from the busy external representative members (Aislinn Melchior, SGVC, also sat on the CoD's KNOW course subcommittee; Carolyn Weisz, DAC, also sat on the subcommittee on Question 6; and Michael Valentine, BHERT, and Chad Gunderson, DAC, were also members of the CoD subcommittee on faculty hiring and retention). In order to fulfill its duties and charges in a timely</p>

	<p>manner, the CoD recommends that two faculty members be added to its numbers for AY1516, for a total of nine. The CoD affirmed the distinct value of its student member, both as a contributing voice from the student perspective, but also as a conduit for information about CoD actions to students. The two staff members of the CoD are also highly valued for their information on campus-wide diversity initiatives, their academic knowledge of diversity issues, and their helpful support during deliberations and implementation of committee charges. All members find their work on the CoD to be meaningful. Finally, CoD members felt it important to review how we coordinate with other campus entities, to clarify the nature of the relationships and the policies that undergird the work of these various offices and committees. This reflection was spurred by the PSC-SLC-BHERT-CoD memo on the seeming conflict of wording between the Faculty Code and the Response Protocol of BHERT.</p>
--	---

The CoD plans to continue its activities to fulfill the standing duties 1-8 from the Faculty Bylaws.

The CoD suggests charges for AY1516:

1. Review department responses to Question 6 written during five-year curriculum assessments.
2. Continue to monitor the number and distribution of approved KNOW courses and take what measures it can to encourage such proposals being submitted by faculty.
3. Monitor the work of the Faculty Search Diversity Liaisons and encourage a wider, trained pool of faculty liaisons from which departments may draw in their faculty searches.
4. Review faculty hiring and retention data by gender and race/ethnicity, and category of appointment (tenure line or visiting).
5. Send a CoD member to the SGVC, so as to continue supporting their work.
6. Work with the PSC, BHERT, and SLC to resolve apparent wording conflicts between the Faculty Code and the Response Protocol to Incidents of Bias or Hate with respect to academic freedom and respecting the rights of all members of the university community.

Institutional Review Board  
Report to the Faculty Senate  
AY 2014-2015

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 2014-2015 academic year.

2014-15 IRB membership: Tim Beyer (co-chair F'14), Kirsten Wilbur (co-chair F'14/chair Sp15); Lisa Ferrari (ex-officio), Joel Elliott, Renee Houston, Jung Kim, Mita Mahato, Siddharth Ramakrishnan, Brad Richards, Sarah Moore (Sp'15), Justin Tiehen, and Troy Christensen (community representative).

This academic year the Institutional Review Board reviewed 103 proposals. Of these 10 were full board (7 approved, 3 pending), 87 were expedited (76 approved, 11 pending), and 6 were exempt (6 approved). In addition the board focused on completing the formal Senate charges as addressed below.

2014/2015 Senate charges to the IRB and IRB response:

- 1. Streamline the existing University of Puget Sound IRB protocol process where possible and communicate with IRB-reliant departments regarding revision of the post-designate IRB protocol process.**

This past year we had a board of seven faculty members and one community member. The IRB protocol process, now that we do not have the departmental designates is to have all IRB protocol submissions go through Jimmy McMichael in the Associate Dean's office. Mr. McMichael then sends all expedited and exempt protocols out to committee members on a rotating basis. All full board protocol submissions go out to all board members for discussion at the next scheduled IRB meeting. Tim Beyer and I have meet with the representatives of the History and Sociology and Anthropology departments this past fall semester to discuss how to handle Oral Histories. Additionally, the departments of Psychology, Communication Studies, Exercise Science, Occupational Therapy, and Physical Therapy have been instructed on the new procedures in place for submitting and reviewing of protocol proposals. All protocol submissions, approval documents and email communication are now stored on the irb share drive.

As a way to further improve the approval process I would recommend the IRB board continue to discuss how best to communicate and track proposal submissions which need further modifications, changes and/or additions.

## **2. Finalize and conclude revisions to the IRB handbook and the website.**

Revisions to the IRB handbook were finalized at our October meeting and the IRB handbook was posted to the IRB website. The revisions include changes to the IRB protocol proposal process as well as changes to the IRB protocol cover sheet. In addition the board tried to simplify the process for determining if a study requires full board, expedited, or exempt review. Many of the proposed changes were submitted to the Senate with last year's year-end report.

Work has been ongoing with changes to the IRB website. Dr. Siddharth Ramakrishnan has taken the lead on working with Barbara Weist in the Office of Communications office and the board should be ready to unveil the new website at the conclusion of spring semester this year. Students and faculty should find it easier to gain access to the IRB webpage and it has been formatted to lead the viewer to the forms needed for an IRB submission by providing link embedded in the text. Additionally, when the CITI training modules become agreed upon there will be links on the IRB webpage for student, faculty, and IRB members to access the CITI training modules.

## **3. Finalize CITI training procedures and disseminate information regarding CITI training to faculty and departments.**

This past semester the IRB was introduced to the Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI) training by Lisa Ferrari and all members spent time completing the various modules to decide which modules would be best suited for student training, faculty training and IRB member training. At our December board meeting it was decided that students could undergo minimal training and that perhaps the training could be embedded within the research methods course the student is part of. Students would need to complete *Students in Research* and *Avoiding Group Harm* modules and submit a completion certificate with their protocol submission. The date of the certificate needs to be within four years of completing the training. It was decided that additional modules are available as needed or recommended by the project chair.

All campus faculty members would have access to the training on a yearly basis and it is recommended they complete the *Belmont Report* and *Defining Research with Human Subjects* modules. For faculty who chair a student project the faculty member would only need to take the training every three years and not need to repeat for every student.

For an IRB member new to the board they would be required to take the *New IRB Member* module and all IRB members would complete the following modules: History and ethical

principles, *Federal Regulations, Assessing Risk, and Informed Consent*. In addition, the chair of the IRB would be required to complete the *Unanticipated Problems* module.

The board decided that modules can be added as needed. Currently the board is waiting to link the CITI training on the revised IRB webpage pending approval from the CITI training organization.

**4. Explore options for significantly reconfiguring the IRB protocol process options, based on the experience of the Puget Sound IRB and the experiences of similar small, private liberal arts colleges.**

IRB members have met with representatives from the departments of Psychology, Sociology and Anthropology, and History to discuss such topics as what constitutes a research project and what is a class project and how do oral histories fit with the IRB process. We have established an MOU with the Psychology department and an MOU with the department of Sociology and Anthropology is in the draft stage.

The board has attempted to simplify the IRB protocol process by revising the IRB webpage and offering links to the various IRB forms and text explaining how to determine if a project requires full board, expedited or exempt review. In addition, the IRB handbook has been revised to provide a clear understanding of the IRB process and examples of documents such as the different consent forms that might be needed in addition to an “investigator’s checklist.” These forms will also be able to be accessed from the IRB webpage.

After a review of the IRB process at universities similar in size to Puget Sound the board has determined that oral histories as such do not meet the federal definition of “research” in the sense of contributing to generalizable knowledge, however the University of Puget Sound IRB will require projects to be submitted for exempt status review. In situations where the population or area of inquiry will directly result in substantial risk to participants the project will be submitted for expedited review.

**5. With respect to the work of the committee during 2014-15, indicate in your end of year report whether the size of the committee was appropriate and identify any committee work that seemed superfluous.**

The size of the board was the same as last year and there was an increase in the number of IRB protocol proposals by eight additional proposals. One of the full board reviews this year from an outside agency was complex and required two meetings for discussion. Each member read between 10 and 15 proposals this year, including the full board reviews. Several of the IRB members did not continue into the spring semester due to sabbaticals; however the board recognizes the difficulty of increasing the membership and trying to find a common time for monthly meetings.

My experience as a co-chair in the fall semester with Tim Beyer was beneficial in sharing the load of the chair and I found that my time spent on IRB matters increased significantly in the spring semester while Dr. Beyer was on sabbatical. I would recommend the position of chair be co-lead in the future.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kirsten Wilbur, MSOT, OTR/L  
IRB Chair AY 2014-15