

**Faculty Senate Meeting
May 11, 2015
McCormick Room, Library**

Senate Members Present

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

Guests

Jan Leuchtenberger, Jeff Matthews, Tiffany MacBain, Sara Freeman

Tubert called the meeting to order at 4:02

Announcements

Tubert mentioned the memo sent from the David Sousa on behalf of the Faculty Compensation Task Force (attached), which states that their full report will be completed this fall.

Approval of minutes from May 4, 2015

M/S/P

Posse Foundation Resolution of Support

A resolution of support regarding the Posse Foundation, drafted by Pierre Ly, was read out loud for ratification by the full senate. M/S/P to accept the resolution as written:

The Faculty Senate was thrilled by the announcement of the groundbreaking new partnership between Puget Sound and the Posse Foundation. It is an honor to join such a distinguished group of participating universities, and we look forward to welcoming the first cohort of outstanding students recruited in the program. All members of the Senate wish to acknowledge the significance of this partnership, and its far-reaching implications for our university. This creates invaluable opportunities not only for the Posse scholars themselves, but also for the Puget Sound community as a whole. Being named a Posse college reinforces Puget Sound's commitment to academic excellence, diversity and making college affordable. Senators would like to express their gratitude to all the campus colleagues who worked so hard on this, and to Trustees and other donors whose dedication and financial support have made the relationship possible.

To learn more about the program, follow [this link](#).

End of Year Report: Academic Standards Committee (ASC)

ASC chair Jan Leuchtenberger summarized the ASC report for the Senate. One of the biggest charges accomplished by the ASC was to revise the incomplete grading policy. The policy until now has been to require incomplete work to be submitted by midterm of the following semester, which is usually already a hectic moment in the academic schedule. The Revised deadline for incomplete work is now the end of the 2nd week of the following semester, with grades due 3 working days after submission. There's still a process in place for appealing that deadline.

Tubert asked about changes to the leave policy; Leuchtenberger noted that regarding charge #8 in the ASC final report, changes were made to the leave policy language to enable *students* greater flexibility to take leaves for health related conditions within *families*, including instances of a partner giving birth.

Sampen asked about changes related to charge #3 in the ASC final report, which states that the committee voted to remove the passage from the academic Handbooks that states, "once a student has earned 16.00 units total, that student is no longer eligible to transfer credit from a community college." Sampen inquired how notification of that change would be communicated to the university community.

Senate moved to accept the ASC report.

End of Year Report: Faculty Advancement Committee

FAC chair Jeff Matthews summarized the report for the Senate, noting how many files were reviewed, how many of those were closed, how many streamlined, how many submitted electronically (see report). Matthews continued with some qualitative observations: that a table showing the pattern of class visits is helpful at the start of the department chair's letter, that colleague observations are sometimes out of sync with the semester in which students write evaluations, that people aren't always submitting hardcopy evidence of professional growth (especially for conference presentations), and that the nature of co-authored collaboration is not always made clear.

Matthews continued with some recommendations: that there isn't a good process for student evaluation and feedback regarding lab work, even though sometimes students spend more time in labs than in class; a better process is needed. Also, department should regularly review and update their departmental guidelines for promotion: some are two decades old and may be out of sync with campus wide standards. Finally, it would be nice to have greater clarity for promotion to full professor regarding the meaning of "distinguished service;" currently the meaning of that criterion is open to variable interpretation.

Haltom asked whether the university really needs to worry about greater clarity regarding co-authored scholarship? Matthews replied that in some cases the author is one of 6 collaborators, and that as a rule more information is better. Buescher asked if the FAC could relay to chairs an example of a class visit table that the FAC considers ideal. Wiese asked whether it's a problem that summer classes are not being evaluated – Matthews indicated it hasn't emerged as a problem. Peine asked about evaluation practices for team taught classes, and whether it creates problems when students are filling out two distinct evaluations for two different instructors – Matthews replied he hasn't seen that emerge as a problem, but that that doesn't mean there isn't a better way.

Senate moved to accept report.

End of Year Report: Professional Standards Committee (PSC)

PSC chair Tiffany MacBain reviewed the work of the committee, mentioning the committee began the year with nine charges and received seven more. Two have been deferred indefinitely. Most of the committee's time and attention went to the review of interpretations to the faculty code. Ten charges are suggested for next year, but some of them are very small and are already in progress. The committee continues to work on guidelines regarding course assistants. MacBain noted that most of the committee doesn't feel their work is superfluous. Regarding size, MacBain requested that the committee not be shrunk too much, because the PSC serves as the place where grievances are heard. Saucedo mentioned that the FAC is going to recommend a couple of charges to the PSC.

Senate moved to accept report

End of Year Report: Curriculum Committee (CC)

Chair Sara Freeman presented the CC report, mentioning that the charges that took up the most time were the work clarifying the distinction between an interdisciplinary *program*, *minor*, and *emphasis*; a lot of work also went into crafting the *Curriculum Impact Statement* guidelines. The committee also worked on the issue of 9 unit limits for majors and overall issues of continuity within the committee. As for the size of the committee, Freeman stated it shouldn't be any smaller.

Haltom and Saucedo asked for clarification regarding charges 4 and 5. Stockdale noted that the CC's recommendation (coming out of charge #1) that the "faculty senate appoint a committee to work during AY 2015-2016 to consider the revision of the core" is a potentially huge undertaking. Beardsley noted that perhaps a variety of groups already have thoughts on this, and might contribute on their own (without an ad hoc committee). Freeman added that we could have a year of conversation about whether, and how, to revise the core, as well as perhaps how to link that discussion up to overarching conversations on campus.

Haltom stated (regarding charge #5) that departments themselves shouldn't be allowed to decide by themselves what can and can't fulfill graduation requirements with regard to cores – a check and balance system is needed w/ the CC to decide whether the department's decision is valid. Beardsley noted that particular care was put into the wording of the CC motion that was passed regarding charge #5.

Buescher asked whether the working group structure was working effectively, and whether dividing the CC into working groups before work actually arrives is the best way to operate, or whether that could lead to imbalances between working groups? Freeman replied that she and the Associate Dean re-balanced work among the working groups midway, and that it isn't a problem to diagnose things and make adjustments as needed. Freeman noted that the much harder things are those which require everyone's attention – which underscores the need for a single meeting time for members of the CC (which is always a divisive topic). Freeman suggested that perhaps availability for a common CC meeting time should be a requirement for serving on the CC.

Stockdale asked about the number of KNOW Courses approved so far --21 – and whether CC feels that we're on track to provide the KNOW overlay requirement. Freeman responded that we'll need 43 courses functional in the next year or more, and that the Diversity Committee seems to be feeling ok with where we're at right now.

Senate moved to accept report.

End of Year Report: Library, Media, and Information Systems (LMIS)

Chair James Bernhard presented the LMIS final report. Bernhard mentioned the item that generated the most discussion this year was the revision to the policy regarding library fines for faculty. Bernhard noted that recently the Office of Admissions has migrated to Peoplesoft. In addition, Bernhard urged that Puget Sound needs to develop an ethics code regarding data use: "We're now going to know every click that anyone clicks about UPS," which is the rationale behind LMIS's request for a future charge to examine this. In terms of technological challenges facing the university, Bernhard mentioned that the library isn't wired all that well.

Senate moved to accept report.

Walter Lowrie Award.

The meeting was closed to discuss the Walter Lowrie Award. Discussion ensued, including about the criteria for the award; a decision was made; results will be communicated later.

Election of Faculty Senate vice-chair and secretary.

Pierre Ly was elected Faculty Senate secretary for next year (2015-6); because he will be on leave in the fall, John Wesley will serve in his place for the fall. Derek Buescher and Jonathan Stockdale were elected to jointly serve as Faculty Senate vice-chair: Buescher will serve in the fall, and Stockdale will serve in the spring.

Motion to adjourn, 5:45 pm.

Minutes prepared by Jonathan Stockdale

Appendix A: Faculty Compensation Task Force memo

To: Ariela Tubert, Chair, Faculty Senate
Fr: Faculty Compensation Task Force (FCTF)
Re: Process and progress report

The FCTF's work is proceeding in three areas, in line with President Thomas's charge to the group:

- (1) Revisions of a draft faculty compensation philosophy, and a set of general policies that will be informed by that philosophy.
 - (2) Finalizing a new draft institutional "peer list," weighing such factors as mission, financial capacity, bond rating, and several measures of faculty workload in defining and assessing the emerging list.
 - (3) Developing and understanding a new model that will help the Dean to project compensation costs under different scenarios (e.g., How many retirements? How many sabbatical replacements?) going forward.
- None of this work has been easy, and none of it will be ready to be presented to the faculty by the end of this term. We would rather not try to engage the faculty on less-than-complete versions of our work, preferring to take comments and suggestions on more polished drafts. For this reason, you should not expect a full report from FCTF until next fall, when there will be time for us to complete our work and time for everyone to engage with what we have done.

Academic Standards Committee 2014-2015 Year-End Report

I. Membership and meetings of the Academic Standards Committee:

Faculty members of the 2014-2015 Academic Standards Committee included Kenneth Clark, Karl Fields, James Jasinski, Kristin Johnson, Adam Smith, Johanna Crane, Jan Leuchtenberger, Martins Linauts, Gary McCall, Don Share, Keith Ward, and Ann Wilson. Student representatives on the ASC were Drew Anderson for the full year, Daniel Laesch in the fall, and Elizabeth King in the spring. Ex-Officio members included Sarah Shives, Lori Ricigliano, Sunil Kukreja, Brad Tomhave, Kelli Delaney and Landon Wade.

Jim Jasinski chaired the ASC during Fall 2014, and Jan Leuchtenberger chaired the committee during Spring 2015.

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

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

1. *Continue consideration of options for revisions of the framework for course schedules with the goals of 1) meeting the preferences of faculty (for example, rethinking the balance of scheduling courses for two, three, or four days per week), 2) using available campus spaces more efficiently, 3) maintaining some commitment to curricular and co-curricular program offerings between 4:00 and 6:00 p.m., and 4) locating a common hour.*

Before the ASC addressed this issue in the spring, it was approached by its Senate liaison and asked if it would prefer to deal with it in the ASC, or whether it would like to ask the Senate to appoint an ad-hoc committee to pursue the charge. The ASC discussed this request at its meeting of February 16, 2015. The conclusion of the Committee was that there were so many stakeholders in this issue that it would be more productive for the Senate to assemble an ad-hoc committee that best represented all of those constituencies. The Committee formally voted to request that the Senate form such a committee. Jan Leuchtenberger then forwarded to our Senate Liaison all of the research that had been compiled by the ASC when it began considering this issue several years ago (at that time deliberation of the issue was put on hold because of the implementation of PeopleSoft).

2. *Review the revisions made by the Offices of the Registrar and Admissions of the published materials made available to prospective students regarding the University's transfer of Running Start credit policy.*

The ASC addressed this charge at its meeting of May 4, 2015. Brad Tomhave reported that the Running Start program is changing and will soon include a new program called Running Start in the High School. Because we cannot revise our admission materials until we know how the new program will take shape, the ASC determined that this charge should be postponed until next fall.

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

3. *Consider revising University policies related to accepting transfer credits either from incoming students or from students already matriculated at Puget Sound (including transfer credits from community college beyond the current "junior status" of 16 units or inclusion of exam scores from the Cambridge Advanced International Certificate of Education in the grouping with current AP and IB transfer credits).*

The ASC considered this charge at its meetings of October 3, 2014 and October 24, 2014. Members of the committee noted that the policy that prohibits students from transferring credits from community colleges after their sophomore year seemed to be a contradictory one, as students on campus are allowed to take 100- or 200-level courses in their junior or senior years. Some members noted that the policy had been put in place a long time ago, when Puget Sound was more of a commuter school, but that it no longer was necessary to maintain the integrity of the four-year college experience. The Committee voted to remove the passage from the Academic Handbook that states, "once a student has earned 16.00 units total, that student is no longer eligible to transfer credit from a community college."

On the question of whether or not to include the Cambridge Advanced International Certificate of Education in the grouping with current AP and IB transfer credits, Brad Tomhave reported that there is the possibility of statewide action among public and private institutions regarding these certificates, so it would be better to wait and see what positions other institutions take.

4. *Consider adopting a medical withdrawal policy in study away or study abroad that involves organizations other than the University of Puget Sound.*

The Committee addressed this issue at its meetings of March 23, 2015 and April 20, 2015. The issue came up when a Puget Sound student withdrew

from a study abroad program early in the semester and then sought to return to campus and resume classes at Puget Sound that same semester. There is no current policy governing this situation. In that case the Petitions Committee asked for some minimal medical documentation so as to ascertain that the student was fit to resume classes at Puget Sound, but since the student hadn't withdrawn according to our on-campus protocol, there was no process or policy relating to reinstatement.

After some discussion the committee decided that it would be wise to amend the existing medical withdrawal policy to state that students taking a medical withdrawal from another institution must go through the University's process governing reinstatement after a medical withdrawal. This will provide the Petitions Subcommittee with the type of documentation that will allow it to better assure that the student is healthy enough to return to classes. New language for the medical withdrawal policy and for the study abroad section of the Handbook was approved by the Committee at the meeting of April 20, 2015.

5. *Clarify and consider revising the Incomplete Grade Policy.*

This issue was addressed at the meetings of December 5, 2014, February 16, March 2, March 23, April 20 and May 4, 2015. Over that time, the Committee discussed several aspects of the Incomplete Grade Policy, including the circumstances under which Incompletes may be given, time to completion of Incompletes, statistics on how many Incompletes are given each year, and how many result in passing and failing grades.

Ultimately, the ASC determined that the portion of the policy that needed revision was the deadline for submitting work, which was originally midterm of the following semester. Not only was the time students had to finish much greater between the spring and fall semesters than it was between the fall and spring semesters, there was concern that students tend to wait until the last minute and they would be less likely to successfully convert the Incomplete when they were fully engaged with classes in the next semester.

The ASC approved a revised Incomplete Grade Policy that requires work to be submitted by the end of the second week of the following semester, with grades due from the instructor within three working days of the submission of the work. New language for the Academic Handbook was approved, though because the Academic Calendar has already been completed, the new policy will not be applied until the 2016-17 academic year.

6. Looking back over the work of the committee during the 2014-15 academic year, indicate in your end of year report whether the size of the committee was appropriate and identify any committee work that seemed superfluous.

The ASC addressed this charge at the meeting of April 20, 2015. The Committee determined that the size seems appropriate. Though it is one of the larger standing committees, it divides into two subcommittees (petitions and policy). In addition, the range of views available from this number of faculty and staff representing departments and offices from across campus are beneficial to the work of the Committee.

Similarly, the Committee felt that the work assigned the Committee is appropriate in quantity and scope.

Additional Charges

7. *Consider revising the sanction policy in the Academic Handbook to take into consideration the role of summer courses in determining a student's academic status.*

This issue was deliberated by the ASC in its meetings of October 3, 2014 and October 24, 2014. Currently, the Handbook policy states that a student placed on Academic Warning who, in the next semester, is again subject to Academic Warning may be suspended by the Academic Standards Committee. Because the language specifies semesters, it was unclear whether or not poor performance in the summer term could trigger a suspension. The ASC approved new policy language that specifically states that the ASC may consider the summer session as a "semester" for purposes of suspending a student. Because this new policy language affected probation and dismissal policies, those policies were similarly revised and that new language was approved at the meeting of November 14, 2014.

8. *Consider developing a Parental Leave Policy or revising the Leave of Absence policy to include specific provisions for partners of pregnant women to allow them to care for the mother and/or child.*

A Parental Leave Subcommittee (Ann Wilson, chair, Sunil Kukreja, Landon Wade, Johanna Crane and Drew Anderson) was formed at the beginning of the fall semester and presented a report to the Policy Subcommittee at the meeting of November 14, 2014. Based on that report, the ASC voted to revise the language of the current Leave of Absence policy on page 28 of the Academic Handbook to be more inclusive of mothers who had recently given birth or adopted a child or partners who need time away to care for the mother and/or child. The new language reads:

Students may request leaves for health or financial reasons, uncertainty about academic or career goals, personal considerations such as health related conditions within families, other significant changes within family circumstances or educational opportunities not available at the university.

9. *Consider revising the way that the Registrar's office applies language transfer credit to satisfy the Foreign Language Graduation Requirement.*

In the past students who took Language 101 in a quarter system and then came here to take 102 with a semester system ended the year with less than 2 full units, thus not satisfying the language requirement. As a result, they have had to take 201 as well to make that up or they have petitioned. Traditionally, those petitions have been denied because they have the option of taking the proficiency test. However, the tests cost the university money and many students in this position have not been able to pass them.

Most language professors feel that finishing 101 (Q) and 101 (S) satisfies the spirit of the language requirement. The issue came up in the Curriculum Committee (CC) last year and language profs in the room asked for something to be done. CC has a working group looking into the issue, but is concerned that it is also an ASC policy issue.

The ASC considered and approved new guiding language for the Registrar's office that would allow them to substitute a single transferred first or second quarter of a 100 college level foreign language course for the 101 level semester provided that the students successfully completes a semester of that foreign language at the 102 college level.

III. ASC Recommendations for Charges to the 2015-16 Academic Standards Committee

1. Review and approve the University's Running Start credit transfer policy as articulated by the Offices of the Registrar and Admissions.

IV. Summary of Petitions and Hearing Boards

Petitions

At the September 5, 2014, meeting of the Academic Standards Committee, the Registrar was delegated the authority to convene a Petition Preview Team of Associate Dean Sunil Kukreja and Academic Advising Director Landon Wade to review and possibly approve petitions submitted by students. The authority to

approve is extended to the Preview Team based on previous approval actions of the Sub-Committee in similar circumstances. Delegating this authority relieves the Petitions Sub-Committee of work on ordinary issues for which the Sub-Committee has a history of approval.

The year-end petitions report for 2013-14 included petitions acted upon from September 6, 2013, to April 2, 2014. Petitions activity for the year continued during the period of April 3 to September 4, 2014. During this time, 92 petitions were acted upon with 83 approved and 9 denied.

To complete the report for 2013-14, covering the period of September 6, 2013, to September 4, 2014, 286 total petitions were acted upon with 260 approved and 26 denied. Of these 286 petitions, almost three quarters involved the following 5 actions:

- 73 Late Registrations
- 44 Readmissions or Reinstatements from Dismissal or Suspension
- 38 Medical Withdrawals
- 30 Reinstatements from a Medical Withdrawal
- 28 Registrations with a Schedule Conflict

213 Total (74%)

The year-end petitions report for 2014-15 covers the period from September 5, 2014, to April 30, 2015. During this time, 223 petitions were acted upon with 204 approved and 19 denied. Of these 223 petitions, almost three quarters involved the following 5 actions:

- 52 Registrations with a Schedule Conflict
- 35 Medical Withdrawals
- 30 Late Registrations
- 29 Readmissions or Reinstatements from Dismissal or Suspension
- 17 Acceptance of Transfer Credit during the Senior Year

163 Total (73%)

Hearing Boards

On behalf of the ASC, Sunil Kukreja convened Hearing Boards during the period between June 2014-April 2014 to review 3 cases related to academics. These included two cases of plagiarism and one grade dispute.

Submitted by Jan Leuchtenberger on behalf of the Academic Standards Committee
May 7, 2015.

April 27, 2015

TO: Faculty Senate

FR: Jeff Matthews, Chair of the Faculty Advancement Committee
On behalf of Bill Barry, Monica DeHart, Jeff Matthews, Doug Sackman, Alexa Tullis (Fall), Stacey Weiss (Spring) and Kris Bartanen

RE: 2014-2015 Annual Report

The Faculty Advancement Committee this year will have completed 59 evaluations:

Type of Review	Number and Status of Evaluations	Used Moodle Site
Tenure	7 (5 open, 2 closed)	5
Tenure and promotion to associate	4 (3 open, 1 closed)	2
Promotion to associate	5 (2 open, 3 closed)	3
Promotion to professor	12 (6 open, 6 closed)	8
3 year assistant/clinical assistant	6 (4 open, 2 closed)	4
3 year associate/clinical associate	6 (2 open, 4 streamlined)	5
5 year professor	16 (4 open, 1 closed, 11 streamlined)	6
3 year instructor	3 (2 open, 1 streamlined)	2
Total	59	35

The committee has forwarded evaluations for tenure, tenure and promotion, promotion to associate, and promotion to professor to the President. Some of these cases were considered by the Board of Trustees at the February 2015 meeting; some will be considered at the May 2015 meeting; one will be considered at the October 2015 meeting.

The Advancement Committee met for a total of 27 hours from October through December 2014 (2, 3, or 4 hours per week depending upon schedule conflicts), and will have met 37 hours (3 hours each week) for the Spring 2015 semester. FAC members estimate that they spend roughly 15 hours per week reading files and preparing evaluation letters.

While we still have files and letters to complete, the Committee offers the following observations:

- The Committee reminds head officers that the deliberative letter – informed by individual colleague letters and deliberative discussion – should address “the needs of the department, school, or program and the university” as a criterion for tenure reviews (see *Faculty Code*, Chapter III, Section 3.d). The *Code* calls for “demonstrated need” for the position.
- Sixty percent of evaluation files this year were submitted electronically. The Committee has found these files to be relatively easy to access and time-saving to review. We are encouraged that Educational Technology colleagues have made further refinements for next year, such that Moodle evaluation sites will be much more like Moodle course sites and, thereby, easier to use by evaluatees and evaluators.
- The Committee encourages evaluatees to include in their files copies of scholarly materials (publications, conference papers, proposals, letters from editors, etc.) that they are citing as evidence of professional growth.

- The Committee appreciates that many head officers have this year provided a chart of class visits at the beginning of deliberative summary letters (who visited what classes and when) in order to document clearly all class visits conducted by colleagues; we encourage this practice by all head officers as we still struggle in some files to discern accurately the ongoing pattern of class visits.
- The Committee observes across a number of files calls from evaluators for evaluatees to make clear their roles in co-authored or collaborative work. Department, school, or program head officers can also assist the FAC in understanding how “author order” for collaborative work is treated in the specific field.
- The Committee encourages colleagues to attend to revised Interpretations of the *Faculty Code* regarding solicitation and submission of external letters; this information will be included in the 2015-2016 Faculty Evaluation Standards and Guidelines (“the buff document”).

The Advancement Committee recommends the following:

- The Committee observes in some files where teaching responsibilities include lecture and laboratory sections that colleagues express hopes for Instructor and Course Evaluation Forms tailored for administration in laboratory sections. The Committee suggests that Professional Standards Committee invite faculty input on this topic.
- The Committee observes that some departmental evaluation guidelines are dated, perhaps creating uneven expectations across areas of the university, particularly in the area of professional growth. We encourage the Professional Standards Committee to consider implementation of a periodic review process for department, school, and program evaluation guidelines.
- The Committee observes lack of clarity about the meaning of “distinguished service in addition to sustained growth . . . in teaching, professional growth, advising, university service, and community service related to professional interests and expertise” (*Faculty Code*, Chapter III, Section 3.e, p. 11) and recommends that the Professional Standards Committee consider a *Code* interpretation to clarify university-wide expectations.

The Advancement Committee, upon recommendation of the University Enrichment Committee, will recommend to the Dean candidates for a junior and senior research award to be presented at the Fall Faculty Dinner.

The Faculty Advancement Committee will discuss other ideas after it finishes with the 2014-2015 evaluations and reserves the opportunity to provide an addendum to this report to the Faculty Senate at or after semester’s end.

Professional Standards Committee 2014-15 Year-End Report

Committee Members: Kris Bartanen, Geoffrey Block, Doug Cannon, Betsy Kirkpatrick, Tiffany MacBain (chair), Andreas Madlung, Mark Reinitz, and Amy Spivey

Below is the list of charges issued to and by the PSC in 2014-15 and a report of the work completed by the PSC in relation to each charge. PSC self-charges are indicated with an asterisk (*); all other charges are Senate-initiated.

BACKGROUND CHECKS

Charge: Review policy for implementation of education verification and seven-year criminal background checks for new faculty hires.

Rationale: The PSC, in December 2013, endorsed moving ahead with these background checks. This charge follows up on that endorsement.

Report: In September 2014 Cindy Matern and Nancy Nieraeth from Human Resources presented to the PSC a proposal for expanding background checks for faculty hiring to include a social security number validation check, educational verification, and criminal background checks. The university already performs National Sex Offender Registry checks for staff and faculty, and prospective staff members are already subject to the extended background check proposed for faculty. Findings from background checks go to the Associate Vice President of Human Resources and CES (Cindy Matern), who then works with the Academic Vice President (Kris Bartanen) to determine whether or not to speak with the candidate about the results of the check and whether or not to proceed with the hire. The PSC asked questions about this decision-making process, about how the university ensures fairness if something unusual turns up during a background check, and about how the university manages the delayed completion of a degree. Following this discussion, the PSC voted unanimously to approve the policy on extended background checks for faculty hiring.

THE FACULTY CODE: INTERPRETATIONS

***Charge:** Review all of the PSC interpretations of the Faculty Code to see if any have become obsolete by more recent interpretations and to ensure consistency of all interpretations with the current practice and policies on campus.

Rationale: This was a self-charge from the 2013-14 year-end report. As a result of changing language regarding domestic partner participation in faculty evaluations the PSC discovered dated language that required updating. There are likely additional areas where language needs to be made consistent.

Report: The PSC review resulted in a number of changes to the Interpretations section of the Faculty Code, all of which are documented in the attached document that was distributed to the Faculty Senate and the Board of Trustees. (SEE APPENDIX A.) On April 20, 2015 the Faculty Senate approved minutes that included

this document and a note to alert faculty members to the changes. The 2015-16 PSC will have to complete the review of the Interpretations yet to be evaluated in the summer of 2015 by the Title IX working group.

Charge: Review the PSC “Unified interpretation of Chapter III, Sections 4, a (1) and 4, a (c). Letters of Evaluation from Persons Outside the Department” to determine if the language on outside letters should be updated for: (a) distinctions of submission process for different types of letters (e.g., letters from co-authors, mentors, reviewers; (b) processes of solicitation of letter writers; (c) dates of submission of outside letters for departmental review; (d) expectations of outside letters; and (e) any additional questions raised in PSC conversations.

Rationale: Given that different departments have different procedures and expectations for outside letters in evaluation files, a uniform process for handling letters seems in order. Additionally, the time frame of letter submission at the department level may to closely align with department deliberations to warrant sufficient integration of outside letters into departmental colleague evaluations.

Report: The document containing suggested revisions to the Interpretations of the Faculty Code addresses this charge. (SEE APPENDIX A.) With respect to the request that the PSC reconsider the requirement for a 10-day lead time on the submission of external letters to the department, the committee determined that 10 working days should be sufficient for incorporating an external letter into a review, especially if those letters could be electronically posted confidentially so that members of the review could have simultaneous access. Moreover, the committee felt that there could be negative consequences to asking for an earlier deadline, such as letter writers not having sufficient time to submit their letters.

Charge: Communicate with departments who use Course Assistants regarding the new Interpretation to Faculty Code, Chapter 1, Part C, Section 2.a. Guidelines for Course Assistants, and review revised guidelines as needed.

Rationale: The interpretation was affirmed by the Academic and Student Affairs Committee of the Board in February 2014. This charge follows up on that work in order to bring departmental CA guidelines into alignment with the interpretation.

Report: In 2013-14 the PSC revised guidelines for employing course assistants and requested materials from departments employing course assistants. Because the PSC has acted so recently on this issue, the committee decided that MacBain and Dean Bartanen would email chairs of affected departments to remind them that guidelines should be updated and brought into compliance with current guidelines. The departments that responded to the request and, consequently, whose guidelines the PSC evaluated and approved, are: Psychology, OT/PT (for OT605/PT605), Physics, and Theater Arts. On Friday, May 1, Yvonne Swinth submitted for review another set of OT guidelines. The PSC was unable to review them prior to the end of the year, so we ask that the 2015-16 PSC take up that work. In addition, next year’s PSC must renew a request for course assistant guidelines from the following

departments and then review the guidelines: Chemistry, Economics, Geology, Math/Computer Science, Art/Art History, Biology, Philosophy, and Exercise Science.

Charge: Communicate with departments regarding the new interpretation to the Faculty Code on Visiting lines and their participation in faculty evaluations.

Rationale: The interpretation was affirmed by the Academic and Student Affairs Committee of the Board. This charge follows up on work in order to bring departmental procedures into compliance with the code.

Report: The PSC was not able to take up this charge during AY2014-15 and recommends that the charge be reissued next year.

Charge: Work collaboratively with the Bias-Education Response Team and the Student Life Committee 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 another 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.).

Rationale: This charge, issued by the Senate in February 2015, arose in response to a discussion of the Full Faculty.

Report: In agreeing to accept the above charge, the committee determined that the purview of the PSC is to compare the language of the Code to the language of the Response Protocol and to inform the Bias-Education Response Team (by way of the Committee on Diversity), the Student Life Committee, and the Senate to what degree the statement is consistent with the Code. Upon such review, the PSC distributed a list of recommended amendments to the Protocol. (SEE APPENDIX B.)

FACULTY REVIEW

***Charge:** Provide guidance on a situation in which a faculty member who is under review and has chosen an open file teaches in the same department as a spouse or partner. Is the evaluatee permitted to describe to her/his spouse or partner the contents of the open file, including letters from colleagues?

Rationale: This issue was brought to the PSC by the chair of a department. The concern is that the spouse/partner’s knowledge of the contents of colleague letters could potentially impact working relationships within the department.

Report: An “open” file means that colleague letters are available for viewing by the candidate, but they are not available for viewing by other departmental colleagues. Letters sent directly to the Academic Vice President are summarized by the Faculty Advancement committee in accord with the Faculty Code. The names of authors are identified and the candidate receives a summary of the content of those letters from the FAC. After viewing the letters in her/his file a candidate is free to talk with anyone, including a spouse or partner, about the content of the letters. Nonetheless,

if a department member feels as though professional ethics have been breached in or beyond a review, the Code indicates that she or he may file a grievance.

Charge: Continue conversation about evaluation schedule recommendations and the possibility of an ad hoc committee of former PSC/FAC members.

Rationale: This was a recommendation of the AY 2013-14 PSC year-end report.

Report: Building upon the work completed by the PSC in AY 2013-14, this year's PSC presented the recommendations for changes to the cycle of faculty evaluation (endorsed by the FAC) to the Faculty Senate. In turn, the Faculty Senate presented the recommendations to the Full Faculty, who voted in favor of the changes and, at a later meeting, voted to institute the changes in AY 2015-16, pending the approval of the Board of Trustees. Please SEE APPENDIX C for an explanation of the changes.

Charge: Create a cycle of review for department and program faculty evaluation standards and criteria.

Rationale: There exists no standing process by which departments and programs regularly review their standards of evaluation.

Report: The PSC was not able to take up this charge during AY2014-15 and recommends that the charge be reissued next year.

Charge: Review and consider endorsement of evaluation guidelines for faculty digital scholarship.

Rationale: As digital scholarship becomes a more common component of faculty professional growth, it is desirable for Puget Sound to implement guidelines for evaluation of such work.

Report: Dean Bartanen, who had authored the charge, presented background on the issue and its relevance to the PSC, as well as draft language for guidelines. The PSC discussed the topic on three occasions, their concerns centered on how to assess the value of digital scholarship across disciplines and whether or not the PSC should be involved in such an undertaking. Ultimately, Bartanen withdrew the charge, observing that perhaps the time is not yet right to act on this issue.

Charge: Clarify questions that have arisen about the faculty evaluation process as a result of the initial implementation of Moodle evaluation sites.

Rationale: The implementation of Moodle evaluation sites has raised questions that are as much about the overall process as they are about e-files, which offers opportunity to clarify process questions for evaluatees, head officers, and evaluators, including:

- (a) Should all administrative assistants be asked to scan Instructor and Course Evaluation Forms, rather than making photocopies? Should there be any revision to PSC-approved protocol for administration of and management of forms?

Report: The committee revised the PSC Evaluation Memo (2013-14) to

administrative assistants to incorporate scanning rather than photocopying of student evaluations. (SEE APPENDIX D) To address concerns about document security, the Buff Document will ask faculty members to delete electronic evaluation files from their computers.

(b) How are outside letters to be handled? Does the head officer, evaluatee, or administrative assistant add them to the e-file?

Report: In the Buff Document the PSC will make clear the conversations we've had about how and when to solicit and receive letters, as documented in the report on suggested revisions to the Interpretations of the Faculty Code. In short: outside letters should be included in the electronic file, and if the head officer needs help scanning, the administrative assistant can provide that support once the Moodle access shifts from the evaluatee to the department.

(c) Should evaluatees upload Instructor and Course Evaluation Forms?

Report: Yes, evaluatees should include these documents in pdf form on their Moodle review sites.

(d) What still needs to be provided in hard copy?

Report: Some evaluatees continue to have a "hybrid" file, e.g., a book to include. In these cases the "hard" materials will be provided as they always have been.

(e) Do departments whose timelines differ from the norm (e.g., Psychology requires their files to be submitted to the department six weeks ahead of due date; Religion guidelines allow the evaluatee access to the file after it is submitted) need to come into alignment? Where is it written that files are due to the department four weeks (20 working days) prior to being due to the FAC?

Report: The PSC discussed this issue at some length, considering the tension between the time constraints faced by the Educational Technology Staff in setting up and managing Moodle evaluation files and the need for some flexibility in due dates based upon departmental evaluation guidelines and longtime practices. Ultimately, the PSC approved for inclusion in the Buff Document a three-column table indicating when files are due to the department (at which point evaluatee access to the file ends), when outside letters are due to the head officer, and when the file is due to the Academic Vice President's office (at which point the FAC can access the file). In addition, the committee agreed on the following changes to due dates indicated by the Buff Document: 1) the December 12 due date for receipt of 3rd-year associate files by the department will be changed to the first day of Spring semester (to match Spring file due dates), unless the Board of Trustees approves the change to the 3rd-year associate review and the evaluatee no longer needs to provide a file for review; 2) the statement (on pp. 13 and 17) that tenure and promotion files are due to departments on September 1 will

be removed, for this date is not always accurate. The text will instead refer readers to the table of due dates.

(f) Additional questions contained in the FAQ prepared by Lauren Nicandri. **Report:** Dean Bartanen prepared a document for the PSC that identifies the key questions that have arisen about evaluation process as members of the faculty transitioned from paper to electronic files. Most of these questions concern due dates and are addressed by the PSC-approved changes to the Buff Document described above. Bartanen indicates that other issues will be cleared up going forward, both by learning from prior mistakes and simplifying processes: giving Moodle access to members of evaluations committees but not to the whole home department; making it easier for evaluatees to link to their Moodle course sites on their Moodle evaluation sites; scanning and “filing” of Instructor and Course Evaluation Forms.

FACULTY AND COURSE EVALUATION

Charge: Return to the issue of electronically administered instructor and course evaluations with the charge to the PSC to develop a faculty survey to assess the potential benefits and concerns of Puget Sound faculty regarding this possibility. After gathering data, provide the Senate with a summary of the problems to solve prior to implementation of any electronic option.

Rationale: This was a charge suggested in the PSC year-end report. However, the Senate acknowledges it may be too early to conduct a survey of the faculty on this issue for two primary reasons: 1) AY 2014 is the first year of systematic use of Moodle for faculty evaluation files which may cause survey confusion and 2) Technology Services needs more time still, given the continued updating of Peoplesoft, before determining a means of secure course evaluations in electronic form. The PSC may wish to table this until AY 2015.

Report: Given the reasons stated in the rationale, which was amended by the Senate (in response to PSC concerns) during Fall 2014, the committee deferred action on the implementation of electronic student evaluations.

***Charge:** Develop a policy or set of guidelines for course/faculty evaluation of team-taught courses.

Rationale: Faculty approach team-teaching in different ways. For example, co-teachers can participate in the course throughout the semester, whether by teaching simultaneously or taking turns, or they can divide the semester into segments, each one led by a different instructor. In the latter case, it makes sense to administer separate course/faculty evaluations for each instructor. In the former case, though, either joint or individual evaluations could be in order. No policy or set of guidelines exists to address this issue.

Report: The PSC was not able to take up this charge during AY2014-15 and recommends that the charge be reissued next year.

OTHER BUSINESS

In addition to taking up formal charges, the PSC attended to other matters during AY2014-15:

1. We reviewed and approved the Faculty Evaluation Guidelines for the Department of French Studies. We reviewed the guidelines for the Department of Art and Art History on May 5, 2015, our last meeting of the year. We sent recommendations for revision to Art and Art History.
2. Madlung issued a question: Given the PSC's determination of the validity of electronic signatures—that is, typed names—on outside letters, why must committees submit hard copies of minutes for archiving? The PSC solicited John Finney's opinion, and it was reported, that for archiving purposes paper copies are still preferred to electronic ones. Even so, the PSC reasoned, the Associate Deans' office can print out minutes that they receive electronically. The Committee agreed to recommend that all standing committees adopt such electronic delivery, relieving faculty of the task of delivering paper copies. The Committee also agreed that the date of posting on the University website be included with each set of minutes. This recommendation was conveyed to the Senate for their dissemination.
3. Dean Bartanen introduced a draft policy for PSC review and possible endorsement: "Faculty Opportunity Hire Policy." This process would provide for a (rare) recruitment and hire process different from what is outlined in the Faculty Recruitment Guidelines. The PSC shares responsibility for some of those guidelines and so engaged in the review of the draft policy. Our conversation involved specifically what we mean by "opportunity hire" and how an opportunity is created; the transparency of an "opportunity hire"; how consistent the draft policy is with the existing Faculty Recruitment Guidelines and with federal law; and to what degree the "opportunity hire" process conforms to existing practices. The PSC recommended changes to the document to address these questions and concerns. A final draft of the policy with the edited language was endorsed by the PSC on May 5, 2015.
4. Members of the Faculty Leave Working Group—Stacey Weiss, Ariela Tubert, and Kena Fox-Dobbs—reported to the committee on the newly drafted Medical and Family Leave policies and Disability Policy (the latter of which has not yet undergone significant revision). Following discussion, the PSC endorsed unanimously the draft Medical and Family Leave Policy, including a revision that automatic delay of any evaluation, not only the tenure evaluation, would accompany a leave.
5. Because the Buff Document includes quotations from Interpretations of the Faculty Code, and because those Interpretations have been revised, the PSC authorized Dean Bartanen to make the following revisions to the Buff Document during the summer of 2015 and to distribute the changes to committee members for their review: the paragraph on top of p. 9 shall be shortened, using the new Code language from Page 48, line 30-31, mentioned above, permitting electronic letters with electronic signatures. A paragraph on p. 14 concerns "informing letter writers about open and closed files." It shall be revised to reflect the revised Code interpretation calling for such information to go to outside letter writers in advance. The "checklist for head officers" on p. 20 shall be revised. #1 shall include an

instruction that when soliciting outside letters, the head officer notifies outside letter writers of the status of the file as open or closed. #3 shall include the following sentence, from the revised Interpretation of Page 48, line 10: "In consultation with the evaluatee, the head officer may also solicit appropriate letters from outside the department or university." Additionally all occurrences of "department chair" in the document shall be changed to "head of department, school, or program."

The charges that the PSC asks to be issued in the 2015-16 AY are:

- Solicit and review the revisions to the Faculty Evaluation Guidelines for the Department of Art and Art History recommended by the PSC in May 2015 (unless completed via email before May 15, 2015).
- Review the Course Assistant Guidelines submitted by Occupational Therapy to the PSC in April 2015.
- Review the Faculty Evaluation Guidelines submitted by the Department of Biology to the PSC in April 2015.
- Complete the review of the Interpretations of the Faculty Code yet to be evaluated in the summer of 2015 by the Title IX working group.
- Continue to communicate with departments who use Course Assistants regarding the new Interpretation to Faculty Code, Chapter 1, Part C, Section 2.a. Guidelines for Course Assistants, and review revised guidelines as needed.
- Communicate with departments regarding the new interpretation to the Faculty Code on Visiting lines and their participation in faculty evaluations.
- Create a cycle of review for department and program faculty evaluation standards and criteria.
- Develop a policy or set of guidelines for course/faculty evaluation of team-taught courses.
- Review the requirements for preparing and submitting evaluation files, in light of the Code changes made this year as to who participates in evaluations. The way things stand Associates prepare evaluation files only when they are being considered for promotion. On the other hand, professors prepare full evaluation files in all evaluations. The code calls for "a statement of professional goals and objectives, teaching materials, documentation of scholarly and professional activity, and evidence of university service, student advising, and community service related to professional interests and expertise." The Buff elaborates this much more fully, including "a statement of your professional objectives, both short-term and long-term, including a self-analysis of your teaching, scholarship, and service." It also calls for copies of courses materials to such an extent that people want simply to link to their Moodle course sites. This makes sense for tenure and promotion, but every five years for the duration?
- Review the line on pages 22-24 of page 11 of the Faculty Code (Chapter 3, Section 3 (e)), which states, "Advancement to the rank of full professor is contingent upon evidence of distinguished service in addition to sustained growth in the above-mentioned areas." The wording of this sentence can be interpreted in two ways: either the candidate's teaching, professional growth, service, advising, etc., must be distinguished, or their performance in the category of service to the university and

community in particular must be distinguished. This ambiguity is potentially a big problem with high-stakes consequences. It would be great if the PSC (and the faculty as a whole) could revise the Code to remove the ambiguity. **Please note: While the PSC self-authored this charge, on May 7, 2015, the PSC chair received a letter on the same subject from faculty members Greg Elliott, Jim Evans, and Andy Rex (SEE APPENDIX E).**

Finally, the Faculty Senate asked that standing committees self-assess to determine whether or not the number of members required of a committee is appropriate. The By-Laws indicate that the PSC “shall consist of the Dean of the University (ex-officio) and no fewer than seven appointed members of the Faculty.”

The PSC did not reach a unanimous decision about either question. Most members of the committee were comfortable with the current size of the committee but could also imagine reconstituting at 6 members + 1 ex-officio dean. One member of the PSC strongly believes that the committee would function well at half its size. To the objection that a smaller committee would not be representative all departments, the committee member pointed out that the PSC is not currently representative. Another potential problem with shrinking the PSC is that, in the event of a grievance, the PSC functions essentially as a jury. Having too few members would place great pressure upon committee members and may not well serve the parties involved in the grievance. One solution is to assign the committee fewer members but, when a grievance arises, to call upon past PSC members to serve for the duration of the grievance process. The Code contains some precedent for amending the constitution of the PSC during grievance processes: In Chapter VI, Section 4.b., “Grievance Procedure,” when there is “a conflict of interest concerning a member of the committee...the committee, at its discretion, may appoint a substitute to participate in the case.” If the Senate determines that the PSC can function well with fewer members, the Senate might charge the PSC with revising this section of the Code, or the Interpretation of this section, to include the plan articulated above.

In the main, the committee did not find its work to be superfluous, but it was noted that we wasted some time in considering how to revise certain Interpretations that would better have been sent first to the Dean of Diversity and Inclusion and the Department of Human Resources for a compliance check. One committee member believes that many documents the PSC reviews (e.g., Department Evaluation Requirements) are much lengthier than they need to be. Encouraging concision university-wide would lessen the work of all committees.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of the PSC,

Tiffany Aldrich MacBain, Chair

APPENDIX A

Recommended Revisions to Interpretations of the Faculty Code Professional Standards Committee 2014-15

Members: Kris Bartanen, Geoffrey Block, Douglas Cannon, Betsy Kirkpatrick, Tiffany MacBain (Chair), Andreas Madlung, Mark Reinitz, Amy Spivey

In the 2014-15 academic year, the Faculty Senate charged the Professional Standards Committee to “review all of the PSC interpretations of the Faculty Code to see if any have become obsolete by more recent interpretations and to ensure consistency of all interpretations with the current practice and policies on campus.” The PSC has completed the review and revised the interpretations as indicated below.

The PSC determines these revisions to be significant and so submits them in accordance with the instructions in the Faculty Code, Chapter I, Part G, Section 1: “If the Professional Standards Committee deems an interpretation to be of significant merit it shall issue a formal written interpretation which shall be delivered to the Faculty Senate for inclusion within the Senate minutes. Such interpretations shall also be forwarded to the Academic and Student Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees for its concurrence.”

Not included below, but in need of revision to align with existing policies, is the Interpretation of Chapter VI (Grievances arising from allegations of sexual harassment). Dean of Diversity and Inclusion Michael Benitez will recommend changes to this Interpretation following the university’s Title IX review in the summer of 2015.

APPENDIX

Page 39, line 8: Because the Appendix contains current interpretations and interpretations that are no longer active, change “This Appendix contains current interpretations” to read “This appendix contains such interpretations.”

Page 39, lines 23-48: Given that technology has evolved to the point where it is easy to search PDFs, and given the potentially incomplete nature over time of the list of references to “working days” in these lines of the Code, the PSC recommends that lines 23-48 be deleted from the Appendix.

Page 40, lines 8-14: Because these lines are outdated and do not align with the language of the “Campus Policy Prohibiting Harassment & Sexual Misconduct” document, delete lines 8-14. Add to the end of this Interpretation (of Chapter I, Part C, Section 2, and Chapter I, Part D, Section 4) the line: “This policy aligns with the university’s conflict of interest provisions in the Code of Conduct as well as Section II, Part E (“Consensual Sexual Relationship”) of the Campus Policy Prohibiting Harassment & Sexual Misconduct.”

Page 41, throughout entire Interpretation of Chapter I, Part C, Section 2, and Chapter I, Part D, Section 4: To bring the language of the Code into compliance with Title IX, as recommended by Dean for Diversity and Inclusion Michael Benitez, replace “spouse” with “partner,” and replace “children” and “child” with “dependent children.”

Page 41, lines 42-49: Committee members expressed concern about ambiguity in the text regarding the timing of PSC reviews of departmental guidelines for the use of course assistants. Change the sentences beginning with “Thus” in line 42 to read, “Thus each department employing course assistants should submit to the Professional Standards Committee a document that explains the duties, responsibilities, and supervision of course assistants. The PSC will review departmental statements for agreement with the guidelines. Upon obtaining committee approval, the department may then employ course assistants in accordance with the departmental document and need not submit that document again for PSC review until the guidelines in the Code or the departmental document are revised.”

Page 42, line 9: To bring the language of the Code into compliance with Title IX, as recommended by Dean for Diversity and Inclusion Michael Benitez, use the gender-neutral pronoun “their” instead of “his/her” in the phrase, “in their courses.”

Page 43, line 15: To correct a problem with sentence structure, the PSC recommends changing the first sentence of line 15 to read, “The evaluation process is clearly career-influencing.”

Page 43, lines 38-39: To correct a typographical error sending readers to an incorrect section of the Code, and to align with the recommended language for page 45, line 5 (below), the PSC recommends changing the lines to read: “If you have concerns regarding obligations under this policy, please refer to Chapter 1, Part D, Section 4 of the *Faculty Code* (‘Professional Ethics’) and/or speak with your head of department, school, or program or the Academic Vice President.” The font size and type should be the same as the surrounding document.

Page 45, line 5: “department head” becomes “head of department, school, or program.” Change sentence to read: “The faculty member must request that there be a delay in consideration for tenure or promotion by writing to the head of department, school, or program and the Academic Vice President, normally no later than one semester before the scheduled evaluation.”

Page 46, Interpretation of Chapter III, section 4. To bring the language of the Code into compliance with Title IX, as recommended by Dean for Diversity and Inclusion Michael Benitez, replace “spouse” and “mate” with “partner.”

Page 47, lines 31-34: To correct outdated language (“photocopied”) and to affirm the writers’ ownership of their letters of evaluation, the PSC recommends that the lines read: “In the case of an open file, the faculty member being evaluated has access to letters in the evaluation file and may take notes while reviewing the file. If the faculty member desires copies of the letters, the faculty member must seek copies from the writers.”

Page 48, line 10: To clarify how outside letters should be solicited for faculty evaluations, add the following statement after the phrase “if they seem relevant”: “In consultation with the evaluatee, the head officer may also solicit appropriate letters from outside the department or university. When soliciting the letters the head officer will notify the letter writers of the status of the file as open or closed.”

Page 48, line 17: For consistency’s sake, change “confidential letters” to “a closed file.”

Page 48, line 18: For clarity’s sake, change “those individuals who submitted letters and a summary...” to “those individuals who submitted letters to the head officer and a summary....”

Page 48, line 19: To correct an error of reference, change “Faculty Code: Chapter III, Section 4, b (2) (a) and Section 4, b (2) (b)” to “Faculty Code: Chapter III, Section 4, b (2) (a) and Section 4, b (2) (e).”

Page 48, lines 29-30: Because the university affirms the validity of electronic signatures, change bracketed note to read: “As defined for purposes of interpretation, a letter of evaluation is a signed document.”

APPENDIX B

To:

George S Tomlin;
Brad Reich;

Cc:

Derek T Buescher;

Dear George and Brad,

As requested by the Faculty Senate, the PSC has reviewed the university's freedom of expression statement for its consistency with the Faculty Code. I'm writing to share our findings with the Student Life Committee and the Committee on Diversity so that you may proceed with your review and/or revision according to your committee schedules. (I am also ccing Derek Buescher, the Senate liaison for the PSC.) Below is a paragraph summarizing the PSC's response:

The committee discussed the new Senate charge to review our statement regarding freedom of expression. The committee compared the language of the paragraph in the [Response Protocol for Incidents of Bias or Hate](#) with the language in the Faculty Code, pp. 2, 3, 5 and 6. The committee identified three areas for discussion. First, the Code states more clearly than the Protocol the distinction between academic freedom and the constitutional right to freedom of expression; it asserts that faculty have the freedom to pursue academic areas authorized by their expertise. The Protocol does not currently acknowledge that the Code recognizes academic freedom as beyond freedom of expression, and that the Code states that it is “an additional assurance to those who teach and pursue knowledge” (page 5) . The committee recommends that the Protocol be amended to include language acknowledging academic freedom of the faculty as defined in the Code or to reference the relevant sections of the Code (Ch. 1, p. 3, lines 10-12.). Second, the committee observed that the second half of the paragraph in the Protocol is more restrictive than the Code. The language in the Protocol seems overstated, urging caution against causing student discomfort, whereas the committee recognizes that discomfort often precedes learning. Furthermore, we prefer the word “injured” as in the Code (Ch 1. p.3, line 10) rather than the word “wounding.” Similarly, the word “safe” implies more than physical safety; we suggest a clarification of the distinction between physical or emotional safety and freedom from discomfort. Third, the Protocol paragraph is intended to cover faculty, staff and students, whereas the Code covers only faculty. In this regard, the language should also be compared for consistency with relevant documents covering staff and students.

I hope you find our response to be of some use.

All the best,
Tiffany

APPENDIX C

Current Faculty Code Language	Amended Faculty Code Language, approved by the Faculty on 3/10/2015; proposed to ASAC for approval 5/15/2015.
<p>Chapter III, Section 2 - When Faculty are Evaluated</p> <p>Faculty shall be evaluated at specified points in their careers with the university, in the manner provided in this chapter.</p> <p>a. Evaluation shall occur prior to all decisions to: (1) promote a faculty member; (2) grant or deny tenure to a faculty member without tenure; and (3) not reappoint a tenure-line faculty member without tenure.</p> <p>b. An evaluation by the head officer shall be made at the conclusion of each year for the first two years of the appointment of a faculty member without tenure, or earlier if a question of non-reappointment is at stake. A copy of the head officer's report shall be sent to the individual under evaluation and to the dean. A copy of the head officer's report shall be placed in the faculty member's evaluation file (Chapter III, Section 8). Except in cases of non-reappointment (Chapter II, Section 5), no further action is required.</p> <p>Persons in the rank of instructor, assistant professor, and associate professor normally shall be evaluated every three years, and professors normally shall be evaluated every five years unless an earlier evaluation is requested by the faculty member, the head officer, or the dean. Unless a more frequent evaluation schedule is specified in the initial appointment letter, evaluations after the third year of employment normally will not be undertaken at intervals shorter than three years. At least one year shall pass between the completion of a normally scheduled evaluation and any new evaluation undertaken solely at the request of the evaluatee.</p>	<p>b. An evaluation by the head officer shall be made at the conclusion of each year for the first two years of the appointment of a faculty member without tenure, or earlier if a question of non-reappointment is at stake. An evaluation by the head officer shall also be made after each three year period of service for those at the rank of associate professor who are not candidates for tenure or promotion unless the evaluatee elects to proceed with a full review in accord with the procedures detailed in Chapter III, section 4. A copy of the head officer's report shall be sent to the individual under evaluation and to the dean. A copy of the head officer's report shall be placed in the faculty member's evaluation file (Chapter III, Section 8). Except in cases of non-reappointment (Chapter II, Section 5), no further action is required.</p>

APPENDIX D

DATE: October 8, 2014
TO: «Chair_First» «Chair_Last», «DepartmentProgramSchool»
FROM: Kris Bartanen, Academic Vice President
SUBJECT: 2014-2015 Course Evaluations

Each year the dean's office and the chairs identify those faculty members for whom departments should administer Instructor and Course Evaluation Forms during the coming year. The list attached includes all faculty currently identified by the dean's office as scheduled for 2015-2016 evaluation by the Faculty Advancement Committee (1) for tenure or promotion consideration; (2) for a three-year evaluations as an instructor, assistant professor or associate professor; or (3) for a five-year evaluation as a professor. It includes as well faculty who are scheduled for tenure evaluation in 2016-2017. Finally, the list includes visiting faculty who should be evaluated on an annual basis, generally in order to provide information on visiting faculty performance to the associate dean's office rather than for Advancement Committee review. For those visiting faculty members whose appointments are renewable and continue beyond the second year, please consult with me regarding a review prior to renewal beyond the third year (see page 23 in the *Faculty Evaluation Criteria and Procedures, 2014-2015* document).

Please note that faculty eligible for tenure consideration in 2017-2018 who anticipate a junior sabbatical fellowship or any other form of one-semester leave should request that Instructor and Course Evaluation Forms be administered in spring 2015 to provide the four semesters of evaluation required for the tenure file. If a full-year leave is anticipated, evaluation forms should also be administered in fall 2014.

Departmental staff should plan to administer Instructor and Course Evaluations for identified faculty before the end of fall term and again toward the end of spring term.

The Professional Standards Committee has established the following procedures for administering university Instructor and Course Evaluation Forms:

1. Instructor and Course Evaluations are to be scheduled by faculty members and administered and processed by professional staff and not by work-study students or faculty.
2. Instructor and Course Evaluation Forms should normally be completed no earlier than the tenth week of class; an exception may be in a team-taught course in which a faculty member only teaches a small segment of the course, in which case evaluation forms can be administered at the conclusion of the faculty member's participation in the course.
3. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to ensure that students are allocated at least twenty minutes of class time to complete Instructor and Course Evaluation Forms. Twenty minutes are required for each faculty member when team teachers are evaluated during the same class period.
4. Faculty members should normally avoid scheduling required evaluations on the last day of class.
5. At whatever point in the class period Instructor and Course Evaluation Forms are administered, the faculty member should absent himself or herself from the classroom before the staff member brings the evaluation forms in and may return only after the staff member has taken the Instructor and Course Evaluation Forms out of the classroom.
6. Students who do not attend the class session at which Instructor and Course Evaluation Forms are administered may not complete an evaluation at any other time.

Please note that the Academic Vice President's copy (white) of the completed Instructor and Course Evaluation Forms must remain under the control of professional staff at all times and should not be

given to the faculty member, the chair, or any other party while the forms remain the responsibility of the department. Professional staff, not work-study students, should process as soon as feasible those forms on which students have requested that their comments be typed and, once typed, shred the handwritten copies of those forms.

In the past, professional staff members have securely photocopied the completed forms onto yellow paper (for the faculty member) and pink paper (for the department). This year, we will adopt a more cost-effective, environmentally responsible, and efficient practice: professional staff will scan evaluations and save each course group as a .pdf (labeled clearly, e.g., Name ENGL 220 Fall 2014). Staff should then forward the complete set of white copies and the relevant .pdfs for all required evaluations to the Office of the Academic Vice President. (White copies for visiting professors, adjunct faculty, and emeriti faculty evaluations should go to the associate dean's office unless designated for formal review.)

Professional staff should handle the departmental copy of the evaluation forms and the faculty member copy with similar care. Staff should forward the .pdfs of evaluation forms directly to the chair and to the faculty member when processing is complete and after course grades have been submitted. Normally, the chair may review copies of student evaluations once course grades have been submitted for the term. There may be circumstances, however, when a chair needs to review evaluation forms before grades have been submitted (e.g., preparing a recommendation for a visiting faculty member seeking employment elsewhere); in such limited instances, and provided written notice (e-mail is acceptable) is given to the evaluatee and/or the dean, the chair may review confidentially .pdf copies before grades have been submitted. The chair and departmental staff should insure that the .pdf copies remain available for use in the evaluation process.

Faculty other than those listed on the attached page may choose to have one or more courses evaluated. Please note that the white copies resulting from such voluntary evaluations should **not** be forwarded to the Office of the Academic Vice President at the time the evaluations are completed. Because some faculty members may decide to include voluntary evaluations in a future evaluation file, however, the white copies of these completed forms, and .pdf department copies, should be made by professional staff and should remain under staff control in the department until the faculty member has determined whether or not they will be used in a future evaluation file. Once course grades have been submitted for the term, the professional staff member will forward .pdf copies of evaluations forms to the faculty member. **All evaluations conducted using the university Instructor and Course Evaluation Form must be conducted under these procedures, unless an exception is approved in advance by the PSC.** Forms are available in the Office of the Academic Vice President.

Please sign and return one copy of this memo to the Office of the Academic Vice President by **October 13, 2014** to verify that your records and ours agree. If they do not agree, please notify my office immediately, either by telephone (extension 3205), or at my e-mail address: acadvp@pugetsound.edu.

Thank you.

Signature, «Chair_First» «Chair_Last»

Date

cc: «Admin_First» «Admin_Last», «DepartmentProgramSchool»

APPENDIX E

To: Ariela Tubert, Chair of the Faculty Senate, and
Tiffany MacBain, Chair of the Professional Standards Committee
From: Jim Evans, Andy Rex and Greg Elliott
Subject: Conflicting interpretations of a key passage in the Faculty Code
Date: May 6, 2015

It has come to our attention that the Faculty Advancement Committee has, over the course of the years, implemented varying interpretations of a key passage in the Faculty Code governing the evaluation of faculty for promotion to the rank of full professor. The possible consequences for evaluations are considerable. The key passage of the Code (Chapter III, Section 3e) reads:

“[1] Faculty promotion shall be based upon the quality of a person's performance of academic duties. [2] Specifically, decisions whether to promote shall be based upon the quality of the faculty member's performance in the following areas, listed in order of importance: (1) teaching; (2) professional growth; (3) advising students; (4) participation in university service; and (5) community service related to professional interests and expertise. [3] Because the university seeks the highest standards for faculty advancement, mere satisfactory performance is no guarantee of promotion. [4] In addition, appointment in the rank of associate professor and professor normally requires a doctoral, or other equivalent terminal degree. [5] Advancement to the rank of full professor is contingent upon evidence of distinguished service in addition to sustained growth in the above-mentioned areas.”

We have numbered the sentences and put them into square brackets for reference below. The problematic statement is [5]: “Advancement to the rank of full professor is contingent upon evidence of distinguished service in addition to sustained growth in the above-mentioned areas.”

One interpretation is that “evidence of distinguished service” refers to distinguished university service (or perhaps some combination of university and community service). A different interpretation has been that “distinguished service” means something like “distinguished performance of one’s duties.” This is the interpretation that all three of us were told about by the people who hired us, when we first arrived at UPS (and on many occasions afterwards). And, in the interpretation we were introduced to, it refers to all areas of one’s work—teaching, professional growth, advising, university service and community service.

It is easy to see how this piece of text could be read in different ways. While the FAC must address each case for promotion individually, and make the call in gray areas, they should not have to operate under a passage of the Code so susceptible to conflicting interpretations. It is vital that the faculty also have a clear understanding of the criteria as they work towards promotion to full professor. We feel that this issue is of sufficient importance for future evaluations (as well as for the current crop of associate professors

who are preparing for evaluations in the near future) that the meaning of the text should be clarified soon. We urge that the issue be taken up, either by the Senate, or by the Professional Standards Committee. We can imagine two possible outcomes, either of which would be worthwhile: either the PSC could issue a ruling clarifying this passage of the Code, or the Senate could involve the faculty in a larger way to clarify the meaning that this passage will have for the future. It is a substantive issue and will play a role in determining what sort of institution we wish to be. When someone is promoted to full professor, shall this be because the person did distinguished work with teaching and scholarship counting most, or because the person did distinguished university service?

In closing, we offer a close reading of the passage in question, which, we believe, demonstrates that the interpretation based on “distinguished overall performance” is the logical choice.

In [2] we are told of the five areas that matter, and their rank in importance. So it would be odd if in [5] the areas that are fourth and fifth in importance are suddenly promoted to be very important indeed, without any explanation.

In [5], “distinguished service” is not qualified by “university” or “community,” so there is no direct textual evidence to support the university service interpretation. The most one would have to go on is an inference, since university service and community service are the only items in the list of five categories that involve the word “service.” It also would be an odd, somewhat redundant construction to single out only one category (service) for the distinguished criterion, followed by the list of all five categories for the sustained growth criterion, when these five also include university and community service, which have just been said to require distinction. A more plausible alternative is that “service” is being used in a general way, as when we say “for 30 years of loyal and meritorious service,” when giving someone a gold watch at retirement. The document was written some 40 years ago, or more, using the language of its day and somewhat heightened language at that.

If in [5] “distinguished service” means distinguished overall performance, that interpretation does not represent a sharp break in the logic of the paragraph (as it would if we took “distinguished service” to be suddenly promoting university service to prime importance). Rather it continues the logic of [3]. For in [3] we learn that mere satisfactory performance is no guarantee of promotion. [5] then makes this specific by saying that “Advancement to the rank of full professor is contingent upon evidence of distinguished service...” Not mere satisfactory performance, then, but distinguished service is required. [5] concludes by clarifying that, no matter what manner of distinction the faculty member demonstrates, it is still necessary to show sustained growth in all five areas.

Date: May 7, 2015
To: Faculty Senate
From: Sara Freeman
Re: 2014-2015 Curriculum Committee Report, pursuant to Article 5 sec. 5 of Faculty Bylaws

This report summarizes the work undertaken by the Curriculum Committee (CC) during the 2014-2015 Academic Year (AY).

All members of the committee worked diligently as individual members of the committee and in their working groups. Gwynne Brown acted as secretary for the year and provided comprehensive minutes. The committee met on the following dates: September 10, September 24, October 8, October 22, November 5, November 12, December 3, January 28, February 11, February 18, February 25, March 4, March 11, March 25, April 8, April 22, and May 6.

Working Group assignments are listed in Appendix A.

Senate Charges and Additional Work of the Curriculum Committee

The committee received addressed the following Senate Charges for AY 2014-2015:

1. *Deferred standing charge:* Complete the review of the Core in general deferred from 2013-2014.

This incredibly large task reached completion with a faculty survey in April, 2015. The survey indicates strong faculty interest in having conversation about revising the core. CC requests that the Faculty Senate appoint a committee to work during AY 2015-2016 to consider the revision of the core.

The core review summary from Working Group 2 is included in Appendix B.

2. *Deferred Senate charge:* Continue the work from AY 2013-2014 to develop a curricular impact statement and process of formal communication for new program proposals.

CC approved a Curriculum Impact Statement procedure and form on March 4, 2015. After response from the Faculty Senate, CC made minor amendments to the CIS on May 6, 2015. A CIS will now need to be part of any proposal for a new program or course of study. How to communicate about and implement the CIS will be part of the continuity work undertaken during summer 2015, described below.

The May 6 text of the CIS is included in Appendix C.

3. *Self charge 1:* Clarify the distinction between an interdisciplinary emphasis and an interdisciplinary minor.

CC discussed these structures for interdisciplinary courses of study across the entire year. Along the way, we rediscovered a document outlining “Guidelines for the Program Designation Interdisciplinary Emphasis” to which almost none of the interdisciplinary emphases conform. We hosted a forum with the directors and faculty of interdisciplinary programs and set the goals of revising those guidelines, creating new guidelines for proposing new interdisciplinary courses of study, and providing interpretive guidelines for future CC working groups about

evaluating interdisciplinary program reviews. This work will be completed during the summer continuity project described below.

4. *Self charge 2*: Work with the registrar regarding transfer units for language classes taken in quarter systems or at community colleges.

In collaboration with the Academic Standards Committee, we passed the following motion on March 4, 2015:

M/S/P: To implement the option of fulfilling the Foreign Language Requirement by the successful completion of two semesters of a foreign language at the 101-102 college level, the Registrar's Office may substitute a single transferred first or second quarter of a 100 college level foreign language course for the 101 level semester provided the student successfully completes a semester of that foreign language at the 102 college level.

5. *New Senate charge*: Determine whether 201- and 202-level language courses can count toward fulfilling the upper division graduation requirement.

On November 5, 2014, we passed the following motion:

M/S/P: 200-level courses with two pre-requisites shall contain the following language in their course descriptions: "Satisfies the Upper Division Graduation Requirement" for courses that count, and "Does not satisfy the Upper Division Graduation Requirement" for courses that departments have decided should not count.

This applies only to those 200-level courses that have two pre-requisites, and not to all 200-level courses.

Brad Tomhave agreed to communicate with departments affected by this change.

6. *New Senate charge*: 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.

Committee members report that serving on CC often feels very overwhelming, especially in years when a new requirement has been implemented, like the KNOW overlay. Many of this year's members also served during the implementation of the new SSI structure for first year seminars. It has been a hectic period for CC, coupled with a sense that the program reviews and reviews of core areas continue to suggest that there are some areas regarding curriculum where it would be nice to have a stronger sense of consensus from the full faculty about what matters most in adjudicating course and program design. When CC feels it has superfluous work, it is because it feels like we often have to "reinvent the wheel" to figure out precedents or histories of how things are evaluated and what policies and documents apply.

Nonetheless, the size of the committee feels appropriate. Due to leaves, the group was smaller this year: we had four working groups with three faculty members in each, rather than five working groups as in past years. The committee size is appropriate in that range, but could not be smaller.

CC initiated a summer continuity project this year that has received funding from the ADO's office through a Burlington Northern Grant. This is our first response to the sense of intensity and lack of efficacy described above. Other things the committee felt would be helpful include: setting a standing meeting time. If you agree to serve on CC, you would need to be available at that time (for the full

hour). Every year, setting the meeting time is a huge hassle, and some members can't be there, or have to leave 10-20 minutes before the actual end of the hour because of their teaching schedule. Next, we suggest spacing out the review schedules: besides the decimal appeal, why do reviews have to happen on a five-year mark? What if they cycled on a seven or eight year rotation? (This is sort of a "the president needs two terms to really accomplish anything" cycle) This would space out the workload, giving CC more time to deliberate and also address other types of business (instead of Faculty Senate always having to appoint ad hoc committees—there is a sense that we would like to see curriculum business stay connected to CC). It would also give programs and department a bit more time to live with their structures before needing to evaluate them again. Finally, workload would be helped by having support for continuity that is ongoing through the year after the 2015 summer project.

The committee also addressed the following items during AY 2014-2015:

1. Five-year reviews of departments and programs

Asian Studies (May 6, 2015)

Biochemistry and Molecular Biology (April 22, 2015)

Hispanic Studies (April 8, 2015)

School of Business and Leadership (April 22, 2015)

Sociology and Anthropology (email vote May 8, 2015)

Theatre (April 8, 2015)

Beyond tracking the responses to question 3 about units in the major; the only notable issue in these reports was the dilemma of BMB as a "program" and ongoing exploration Asian Studies will undertake about how best to be an interdisciplinary program. CC elected to make the unusual exemption not requiring a review from BMB because the curriculum this program delivers are administered by the Biology and Chemistry departments and evaluated in their department reviews already.

*Full Working Group reports on five years reviews are in **Appendixes D-I**.*

2. Ongoing Assessments and Evaluations of Core rubrics

The Core as a Whole (report delivered April 22, 2015)

Mathematical Approaches (report accepted by email vote May 8, 2015)

Commentary on the review of the core is above.

*The Full Working Group report on the Math Approaches core area is in **Appendix J**.*

3. Evaluation of Core course proposals

CC approved a total of 21 courses for the KNOW designation; 11 SSI courses (4 SSI 1; 7 SSI 2); 4 Humanistic Approaches courses; and 3 Connections courses.

Early in the year, committee discussion explored and anticipated the pitfalls and precedents of evaluating courses for the KNOW rubric. In practice this went very smoothly and provoked little discussion after October.

The committee also updated the Curriculum Proposal Form so the request for cover letter would suggest that it should be 1-2 pages long, to encourage brevity.

4. Establishment of the Academic Calendar

Calendar for 2015-2016 and draft calendar for 2018-2019 approved by vote on May 6, 2015.

5. Approval of Special Interdisciplinary Majors:

Two SIMS received approval:

Alena Karkanias, New Media Studies (November 12, 2014)

Abby Scurfield, Neuroscience (January 28, 2015)

6. Evaluation of a proposal for a new interdisciplinary Environmental Studies major (approved March 11, 2015).

Evaluation and discussion of this proposal took four months, since the new major structure requires a primary major in order to be an ENVR major. Initially, the notion of a “linked interdisciplinary major” provoked much concern. In the end, the EPDM program framed the requirement for a primary major without the notion of a “link” and CC approved that major design. CC is aware that it has informally approved a “type” or “format” for interdisciplinary majors, and this is one of the topics that will need follow up and attention as CC considers issues of continuity.

7. Question 3 in the Department Self Study and the 9 unit “limit” on majors

After the 2013-2014 CC “affirmed the relevance” of the 9-unit limit for department classes in a major (by policy majors can be 16 units if prerequisites or other requirements are classes not in the department), CC was left with concern about how to evaluate department’s responses to question 3 on the self study in their reviews. Should CC “enforce” a limit on major units at 9 or 10? This year, CC agreed to record the discussion about question 3 between working groups and departments in order to start building a sense of what CC deems to be strong reasoning around the numbers of units in majors.

Additionally, a request from the School of Music to increase their Bachelor of Music requirements to 16.5 units from 16 unites was referred to WG 1. In the end, the School of Music did not officially make this proposal.

8. Feedback to a proposal for an African American Studies major.

The AFAM program submitted a major proposal on January 25, 2015 and received feedback from Working Group 2 on March 9. The program did not return the proposal to the committee before our final meeting. This business may return to the docket next year.

9. New Format Courses and Syllabi

Proposals by faculty envisioning courses in unusual formats, some with precedent, some without, required attention. When CONN 370, which takes a group of students to Rome, was approved, it raised questions about how CC interfaces with the International Education committee around travel classes. CC has chosen to proceed expecting that faculty proposing travel classes will already have worked with International Education to have their logistics well in order. CC weighed in about a plan for a Washington State Legislature Internship package of classes and internship credits that also featured a condensed format class. There were many types of support and concern expressed about these structures and full proposal will have to come back before the committee next year. Likewise, we gave the ADO permission to oversee a pilot offering of an upper level German language/HUM core class taught in both German and English for a mixed cohort of students. Finally, CC received SSI syllabi trying to find a way to have a standing structure for visiting professors and new hires to be able to use and fill with their own content. At this point, CC is not ready to approve this type of SSI syllabus, and have made provisions with Communication Studies for syllabi designed by the incoming faculty to be approved over the summer.

10. Summer Continuity Project

On many issues, like evaluating SIMS and what's at stake around interdisciplinary programs, CC noted how hard it is to track continuity about our work and operative interpretive standards. Associate Dean Sunil Kukreja approved a proposal for week's worth of work for 4-6 people, funded by a Burlington Northern grant to develop better continuity for CC: activities will include creating resources for the committee itself and for faculty submitting to the committee. Sara Freeman, Alan Krause, Gwynne Brown, and Luc Boisvert will work together in June 2015 to build on the good processes of this year and to create mechanisms for

- Accessing and organizing already existing guidelines in a prominent way (at this point things like this are often found later or overlooked because we don't know they exist)
- Compiling basic guidelines for a myriad of committee processes and types of proposals
- Recording emergent and ratified interpretative statements or guidelines in an interactive format

Business to be carried over to 2015-2016 and Recommendations for Future Charges:

1. Reviews Scheduled for 2014-2015 that we deferred:
 - a. Natural Sciences Core Area
2. Business raised that will need to be fully addressed during AY 2015-2016:
 - a. Washington State Legislature Internship semester class package
 - b. Faculty meeting motion to reduce teaching days in spring semester
 - c. African American Studies major proposal
3. Recommendations for Future Charges:
 - a. Consider the issues for students, the registrar, and evaluating committees related to syllabi that are regularly presented in a foreign language.
 - b. Continue efforts at greater continuity and communication, pursuant to the summer work funded by Burlington Northern, finding a way to structure good processes without unduly burdening working groups in the midst of the evaluative work that comes each year.

Appendix A

Working group assignments 2014-2015

WG1 [Asian Studies, Hispanic Studies, SBL, KNOW proposals (CN and non-core), SIM proposals, Senate charge re: foreign language transfer credit):

- Rich Anderson-Connolly
- Nancy Bristow (lead)
- Lisa Ferrari
- Elise Richman
- Brad Tomhave

WG2 [ENVR major, AFAM major, Core as a whole, Senate charge re: 201/202 languages]:

- Bill Beardsley (fall only)
- Luc Boisvert (spring only)
- Lisa Ferrari
- Nick Kontogeorgopoulos (lead)
- Janet Marcavage
- Alison Simmons

WG3 [SOAN, Mathematical Approaches core area, KNOW proposals (core, except CN), All approaches course proposals, CN proposals]:

- James Evans
- Luc Boisvert (fall only)
- Alan Krause (spring only)
- Lisa Ferrari
- Julia Looper (lead)
- Tim Pogar

WG4 [THTR, BMB, SSI proposals, Senate charge re: curriculum impact statement]:

- Rob Beezer (lead protem; Rogers paternity flex time)
- Jane Carlin
- Lisa Ferrari
- Lisa Johnson
- Brett Rogers (lead)

Appendix B Review of the Core as a Whole

Item 4 from Working Group 2 End of Year Report:

Review of the core as a whole

- The document titled “Core Area Curriculum Review,” based on the April 28, 2003 Curriculum Committee minutes, states the following:
In addition to regularly scheduled departmental reviews, the curriculum committee should institute the practice of reviewing two core areas every year (beginning with the first year seminars) and, every fifth year, examine the core as a whole. Rather than focusing on design (how courses adhere to category guidelines) and outcome assessment, fifth year core reviews should examine the overall coherence and/or appropriateness of the core categories.
- A working group from the 2013-2014 Curriculum Committee began work on the fifth year core review, but could not complete this assignment.
- After receiving several documents from the previous year’s working group, Working Group Two examined the most recent core area reviews, but found very little information that could be used to assess the overall coherence and appropriateness of the core categories.
- In Spring, 2015, Working Group Two developed a faculty survey, with the assistance of Ellen Peters in Institutional Research.
- The survey was sent to all tenure-line faculty on March 30, 2015. A total of 117 faculty participated in the survey (this represents 55% of those who received an invitation to participate in the survey).
- On April 13, 2015, our working group received the results from Ellen Peters, and then met on April 16, 2015 to discuss the results (which came to 50 single spaced pages of text).
- On April 22, 2015, a summary of the results was presented to the Curriculum Committee (Appendix 3, attached to this report).
Moving forward, we suggest that in the Curriculum Committee’s final report for 2014-2015, a request be made that the Senate create an ad hoc committee, workgroup, task force (or whatever term best fits the situation) to examine the core curriculum, with the purpose of soliciting ideas and working on potential revisions to the existing core. This group will receive the results of the core survey, as well as work with Institutional Research to identify potential areas of change. The group will also get information such as the recent Senate report on Connections. Since only 18% of faculty surveyed want to keep the core as it is, there obviously needs to be a conversation about possible revisions to the core. Working Group Two believes that it makes sense that a wide range of data (from the Curriculum Committee, from the Senate (e.g., the Connections report), Institutional Research, and elsewhere) be reviewed by one group, all year long (or longer) in order to consider possible revisions to the core. We believe that this kind of work cannot be handled by any one existing committee at the moment, because there is simply too much other work to be done already in our committees. The ad hoc committee that is formed can work on nothing else other than possible changes to the core, and ideally, this group will be open to faculty who are interested in getting involved.

Appendix C:

Curricular Impact Statement

Rationale

During academic years 2013-2014 and 2014-2015, the Faculty Senate charged the Curriculum Committee to “[d]evelop a curricular impact statement and process of formal communication for new program proposals (e.g., to Chairs and Directors) prior to program approval.” The Senate’s stated rationale for the charge was “to allow a channel of feedback from impacted programs to both the curriculum committee and program proposers.” In response, the Curriculum Committee requests that proposers of new majors, minors, interdisciplinary programs, emphases, and other courses of study complete a Curricular Impact Statement (CIS). Proposals will be considered incomplete until the statement is submitted.

Purpose

Proposals for new majors, minors, emphases, interdisciplinary programs, or other courses of study must include a CIS in order to:

1. demonstrate the limitations of the current curricular structure and explain how those limitations warrant a new course of study;
2. ensure and document that principal stakeholders are aware of the implications of the new course of study for existing programs; and,
3. explain which additional resources may be required in order to deliver the new course of study effectively.

A Curricular Impact Statement must include each of the following:

1. A statement of rationale that explains why students are unable to meet the learning objectives of the new course of study given the university's existing offerings of majors, minors, emphases, interdisciplinary programs, or other courses of study.
2. A statement identifying:
 - a. which departments, programs, or schools may primarily be affected by the proposed course of study; and,
 - b. how these departments, programs, or schools may be affected by the proposed course of study. This discussion might include, but is not limited to: (1) any courses that will be cross-listed; (2) any existing courses that will be required, recommended, or potentially used to satisfy the requirements of the new program; and (3) any existing departments, programs, and schools that may see a significant increase or reduction in course enrollments due to the new course of study.
 - c. which departments, programs, or schools have been notified in writing of the proposal for the new course of study.
3. Letters from directors or chairs of the departments, programs, or schools identified in part 2 of the CIS that explain either:
 - a. the new course of study being proposed can be supported with the existing resources of the department, program, or school; or,
 - b. the new course of study being proposed cannot be supported with the existing resources of the department, program, or school, but the department, program, or school will be able to support the new course of study by making specifically identified adjustments in course offerings or resources by the time the new course of study is offered; or,
 - c. the new course of study being proposed is not supported by the department, program, or school.
4. A statement identifying what additional resources may be required in order to deliver the new course of study effectively.

Amended by CC at the request of the Faculty Senate 6 May 2016

Motion approved by CC 4 March 2015

Motion drafted by WG 4 [Beezer, Carlin, Ferrari, Johnson, & Rogers] (Feb. 2015)

Based on Draft (Feb 2014) [Anderson-Connolly, Beardsley, & Johnson]

**Report of the Curriculum Committee (WG1) on the
Asian Studies Program Five-Year Review
May 5, 2015**

Working Group 1 of the Curriculum Committee (Richard Anderson-Connolly, Nancy Bristow [lead] Lisa Ferrari, Elise Richman, Brad Tomhave) recommends the acceptance of the 5-year curriculum review submitted by the Asian Studies Program.

On March 22, following our close reading and detailed discussion of the submitted materials, we sent a series of questions and comments to the program. On April 30 we received a response from the department. On May 5 we completed our review and are now ready to move it for acceptance by the full committee. It is clear that the program has worked hard through its recent transition to create majors, minors and emphases that serve our students well and that fulfill the university's educational mission. We make note of the particular strengths in this review:

- Asian Studies has done significant and creative work during what has been a transition period, in particular in its careful integration of the Asian Languages and Cultures faculty and curriculum into the program, including the two majors this includes, Japanese Language and Culture and Chinese Language and Culture. During this transition the program has continued to evolve with attention to the needs of the students and university and disciplinary trends.
- The working group applauds the program's commitment to serving the general student population alongside those engaged with the Interdisciplinary Emphasis in Asian Studies and the two majors. The fact that over 50% of students at Puget Sound take at least one course in the Asian Studies curriculum reflects the breadth of this service, even as the 50 majors and 40 minors testifies to the many students who engage deeply with the program.
- Asian Studies makes important contributions to the educational mission of the university both inside and outside the classrooms. Its contributions to the goals articulated in the Diversity Statement are also extensive.
- The program has been responsible for innovative developments in the university's curriculum. We call attention in particular to SOAN 312, which has proven a model for others interested in integrating travel into a course experience.
- Asian Studies also articulates a forward-looking vision that suggests the richness of the last five years is likely to continue into the future.

The Working Group would also offer two suggestions for the Asian Studies Program to consider.

- Though the Working Group recognizes that the practice for presenting syllabi for Chinese language courses reflects commendable technological innovation, for future Curriculum Reviews it might be useful to provide the Curriculum Committee with a fuller explanation of how the essential course information is communicated to students.
- While the Program may be technically justified in their restrictions on double-counting between the Emphasis and the majors, the Working Group believes that this is not consistent with the spirit and the intent of the Emphasis designation as an overlay, and encourage the Program to revisit this as they continue their transition.

**Curriculum Committee (Working Group 4) Report
on the Biochemistry & Molecular Biology Program Curriculum Review
April 2015**

Working Group 4 (Rob Beezer, Jane Carlin, Lisa Ferrari, Lisa Johnson, and Brett Rogers) acknowledges the thoughtful responses associated with the Biochemistry & Molecular Biology (BMB) Program review document. We recognize the time and effort that has been put into completing the program review. It is evident, based on the data provided, that the degrees offered in these two disciplines, Biochemistry and Molecular & Cellular Biology, address unique approaches in Chemistry and Biology. The growth in majors since the inception of these degree programs reinforces their importance. These two degree programs are administered by their respective departments and while each draws on the courses offered by the other, they are administrated independently of one another. The Working Group spent much time discussing the unusual structure of the BMB Program. We note that other programs at UPS develop shared courses and experiences, as well as have a standing governing committee. The BMB Program does not at present have any of these features.

After consultation with the Curriculum Committee, the Working Group recommends that the two majors and their respective curricula not be evaluated together as a single program; rather we recommend that, in the future, evaluation of the Molecular & Cellular Biology major curriculum be included with the quinquennial review of the Biology department (as it was in 2011), and evaluation of the Biochemistry major curriculum be included with the quinquennial review of the Chemistry department.

The Working Group also recommends that the current BMB program model remain in place and continue to serve in both an advisory and planning role, in order to provide opportunities for faculty engagement, as well as to provide for development and evaluation of these very important areas of study. The Curriculum Committee recommends that an individual program review for the BMB Program should not be required in the future, since the curriculum review would be integrated into the respective departmental reviews. However, the Working Group also recommends that stakeholders consider structuring the BMB Program in a way that it can be useful for coordination, consultation, equipment planning, grant-seeking, informing current and prospective students, informing potential employers, etc. without necessitating curriculum review.

Once again, we recognize the considerable time and effort spent in preparing the review statement. The fact that the review process “invigorated the desire to improve upon current assessment tools and consider more deeply how to use them” demonstrates the value and importance of continued collaboration and planning.

**Report of the Curriculum Committee (WG1) on the
Hispanic Studies Five-Year Review
April 2015**

Working Group 1 of the Curriculum Committee recommends the acceptance of the 5-year curriculum review submitted by the Hispanic Studies Department.

On February 6, following our close reading and detailed discussion of the submitted materials, we sent a series of questions and comments to the department, largely focused on the Hispanic Interdisciplinary Studies major (a 14 unit major distinct from the Bachelor of Arts in Language, Culture, and Literature: Hispanic Studies). On March 30 we received a response from the department. On March 31 we completed our review and are now ready to move it for acceptance by the full committee. Our review of this department's work makes clear that students who enroll in courses in this program encounter a rich intellectual environment, and one in which they have opportunities to grow as thinkers, writers, speakers and human beings.

We make particular note of the following strengths evident in this review:

- Hispanic Studies articulates well the importance of its work to the educational mission of the university and the range of significant contributions it offers to the campus and regional learning communities. The timeliness of the department's intellectual work for both the academy and the country only enhances these contributions.
- The department offers clear evidence that its faculty members are active scholars, modeling the value and effectiveness of the teacher-scholar model.
- Hispanic Studies has done important work reframing its curriculum since the dissolution of the Foreign Languages Department and its creation as an independent department. The department's curriculum reflects the faculty's expertise as well as its efforts to draw on developments in the field.
- The department's responsiveness to student need is reflected in the creation of Spanish 110. We appreciate the department's clear commitment to majors and non-majors alike.
- Hispanic Studies' capstone experience, including both a senior paper and a portfolio, offers students a comprehensive culminating experience in the major.
- Hispanic Studies remains a leader in digital literacy among the faculty, providing both a model and encouragement to other faculty.
- Hispanic Studies has articulated a clear vision for the future, including a sense of its purposes and goals. We applaud in particular the possibility of creating First-Year Seminars taught in Spanish.

In looking forward to an item that might be addressed in the next curriculum review, the working group discussed three somewhat separate issues concerning the Hispanic International Studies major . First, with only 4 enrolled majors in Spring 2015, it may be worthwhile for the department to discuss whether there is sufficient demand from students to maintain the major. Second, given the development of such majors, minors, and interdisciplinary emphases as IPE, Asian Studies, International Business, and Global Development Studies since the introduction of FLIA, the precursor to Hispanic International Studies, it might be worthwhile for the department to consider the combination of a Spanish major or minor with one of these newer programs to meet the academic goals of Hispanic International Studies without having to maintain and administer the major. Third, it appears the language, culture, and literature courses in Hispanic International Studies are somewhat separate from the international politics, business, and economics courses in the major. To make the Hispanic International Studies major more distinct from the possible major/minor/program combinations the working group discussed as its second issue, perhaps there is a way to develop more integration between the Hispanic courses and the International courses in the major either through a course or a capstone experience.

Again, though, let us reiterate what we see as the great strength evident in this department and its curriculum, and applaud the valuable contributions we see both making to the university and its students.

**Report of the Curriculum Committee (WG1) on the
School of Business and Leadership Five-Year Review
April 2015**

Working Group 1 of the Curriculum Committee recommends the acceptance of the 5-year curriculum review submitted by the School of Business and Leadership.

We commend the School of Business and Leadership (SBL) for their thoughtful and thorough review of their curriculum. It is clear that this program is making valuable contributions to the university's educational mission.

We make particular note of the following strengths evident in the SBL's work:

- The faculty in the SBL have a clear sense of their core learning goals, articulated with clarity and power in both the SBL Learning Outcomes and the SBL Educational Mission.
- The SBL faculty have worked hard to intensify the exposure of their students to international issues, a commitment made clear in the integration of international material into all of the foundation business courses.
- The commitment to a liberal arts education is clear in the breadth of the major, which exposes students to the five functional areas of business, including accounting, finance, law and ethics, management and marketing, as well as the requirement for two courses outside the school, including economics and mathematics.
- The SBL takes its responsibilities to Writing Across the Curriculum very seriously and offered extensive explanation of how this is accomplished across a range of courses.
- The SBL is attentive to its service to majors and non-majors alike. They have three courses in particular that regularly fulfill students' requirement for upper-division courses outside their major.
- The SBL also carefully coordinates its cooperative work with two other programs as they facilitate their students' engagement in cross-disciplinary work.
- The Business Leadership Program's use of a cohort model does important work building a sense of intellectual community for its students.
- The SBL is taking the lead in encouraging its students to engage in experiential learning, for instance requiring that students in the International Business major complete an international experience and those in the Business Leadership Program complete an internship.

The Working Group would also offer a few suggestions for the School of Business Leadership to consider.

- We recognize that the faculty member who taught BUS 407 is no longer at the university. While the SBL explained the rationale for keeping BUS 408 on the books, we were not sure why BUS 407 remained there.
- We applaud the SBL's development of the Senior Exit Survey to measure student perceptions of the school's success in meeting its learning outcome goals. We note, though, that such a tool means that the program's assessment efforts rely exclusively on student feedback. Given this, we encourage the SBL to pursue additional assessment mechanisms, for instance the use of the senior research paper or consulting report that is posited as an additional option in the review.
- As a general suggestion, we wondered if it would be useful to have courses with pre-requisites articulate the value of those earlier courses as grounding for the course. A simple suggestion of the carry-over value would help students understand the importance of the pre-requisites and the linkages between courses in the major.
- We also want to offer a gentle reminder that, when possible, the university encourages faculty to include reminders in their syllabi about Academic Integrity, the Office of Student Accessibility and Accommodation, Campus Emergencies, and the Bereavement Policy. While many of the syllabi included all of these, many were missing at least one, most commonly the Bereavement Policy or the information on the Office of Student Accessibility and Accommodation.

Again, though, we applaud the intentionality of the SBL evident in its curricular revisions and in this review, and note the valuable contributions to the university's educational goals the faculty in this program make.

**Working Group 3 report on the Department of Sociology and Anthropology
curriculum review
Curriculum Committee
May 2015**

Working Group 3 (James Evans, Lisa Ferrari, Alan Krause, Julia Looper, and Tim Pogar) recommends that the Curriculum Committee accept the 5-year curriculum review submitted by the Department of Sociology and Anthropology (SOAN). We thoroughly read and discussed the review, asked for and received clarification on some points from the department, and discussed the department's responses. We appreciate that SOAN thoughtfully prepared the original document and took the time to thoroughly address our concerns. We would like to commend SOAN on the following features of their major and department:

- The department has put a great deal of care into its recent restructuring, including revising introductory courses to provide clear foundations in each of the two disciplines (sociology and anthropology) it comprises. This has led to a major with a very clear structure.
- This restructuring has helped the department move towards creating a "departmental identity that unifies our community."
- The department encourages its students to develop as researchers by preparing for and participating in conferences. The students have frequently won undergrad research awards at the Pacific Sociological Association.
- The department offers courses that address a wide range of challenging issues (both internationally and in a national setting.)
- The SOAN faculty teaches courses in many areas of the core including SSIs, humanistic approaches, social sciences approaches, connections, and KNOW courses.
- The department is using technology to engage students and alumni through a blog.

The members of working group 3 believe that the SOAN program is functioning well. As the department considers changes in the future, we request they consider the following comments:

- The members of the SOAN department commented that they do not have an Africanist on the faculty. Members of working group 3 agree that a faculty member with expertise in this area would enhance the major.
- Because the disciplines of Sociology and Anthropology often address issues of social control, social problems, (in)equality, and social justice, SOAN may be able to offer more courses that meet the KNOW requirement.
- The Curriculum Committee last year affirmed its preference for majors of no more than nine units.

This semester, the Curriculum Committee voted to keep better track of departments' and programs' reasons for exceeding nine units in the major. We append the entirety of the department's response to our question about the number of required courses in the major.

Question from Working Group 3:

Finally, the working group had a few concerns about the 11 unit major. We appreciate the tension between preparing students in two distinct disciplines and the liberal arts mission of the university. With this in mind, would you expand on why it is necessary for your students to take 4 electives as part of the major? For example, a student could pick a track and focus more on one discipline while still getting a background in the other as a way of possibly decreasing the course requirements of the major. As the working group discussed this issue, we wondered how common a major with a combined track in Sociology and Anthropology is at a liberal arts college. Could you speak to these comments to help the working group better understand the 11 unit major?

Response from SOAN:

While it cannot be argued that 11 units are necessary in a strict sense we believe that our rationale is reasonable given our joint major in the distinct but related fields of sociology and anthropology. There seem to be two issues involved in the committee's question. The first involves the number of units. The second involves the administrative issues of combined majors and tracks. While they can be identified separately, the committee is correct in seeing them as related.

Puget Sound is in good company in terms of having a combined major. According to a study by the American Sociological Association,¹ "25 of the top 50 liberal arts institutions have a joint sociology/anthropology department." While it is therefore not uncommon to see separate departments in sociology and anthropology, we see neither curricular nor administrative reasons to move in that direction here.

¹ Edward Kain et al., (2006) *Models and Best Practices for Joint Sociology-Anthropology Departments*, available at http://www.asanet.org/documents/teaching/pdfs/Sociology_and_Anthropology_Joint_Departments.p

df

Regarding our decision to offer a single degree rather than separate tracks in sociology and anthropology, there is more variety among liberal arts colleges but our model is the most common. There are trade-offs involved in a tracking model but our decision depends more on departmental culture than a narrow curricular evaluation. At one time the Department of Comparative Sociology did indeed offer tracks (or concentrations, as they were called) within the major for sociology, anthropology, and social services. This model was abandoned in part because it fostered an unfortunate division among the students (and even among some faculty) according to disciplinary leanings, and magnified (and even reified, we might say) the significance of those leanings. Given the absence of strong curricular reasons to reinstate tracks, we prefer to encourage a departmental identity that unifies our community.

Our configuration as a joint department and our decision not to create tracks do impact the number of units we require for the major. If we were separate departments we might have an anthropology major that required nine units in anthropology and two units outside the department in sociology; the sociology major could require nine units in sociology and two units in anthropology. In this case each would be regarded as a nine-unit major. But as a joint Department of Sociology and Anthropology those extra units fall within the same administrative category.

The required courses for the major are introductory courses in both sociology and anthropology, methods courses in both sociology and anthropology, a theory course, Power and Inequality (SOAN 301), and senior thesis. We are already up to seven courses and, given the joint nature of the degree, there does not seem to be anything that could responsibly be removed from the major.

Yet the disciplines of both sociology and anthropology are largely built around the study of institutions, slices of society according to similar categories, activities, or locations, like the family, gender, criminology, race and ethnicity, education, health and medicine, urban life, Latin America, Southeast Asia, India, and the Arabian Peninsula. The required courses, except for senior thesis, are meant to develop the intellectual tools necessary to analyze those institutions. As a department we believe that students should be exposed to at least four of these topics in order to maintain the value of their degree in Sociology and Anthropology. We could, of course, come down to three or even two electives but then some of our students might graduate with a rather narrow and shallow understanding of the diversity of institutions that forms social life.

**Working Group 4 report on the Department of Theatre Arts curriculum review
Curriculum Committee
March 2015**

Working Group 4 (Rob Beezer, Jane Carlin, Lisa Ferrari, Lisa Johnson, Brett Rogers) recommends that the Curriculum Committee accept the 5-year curriculum review submitted by the Department of Theatre Arts. We thoroughly read and discussed the review, asked for and received clarification on some points from the department, and discussed the department's responses. We commend Theatre Arts for their thoughtful and detailed answers to the review questions, and their collaborative approach to preparing the document. We identify the following elements of their report and their work as especially praiseworthy:

- The department's deep commitment to students is apparent in the care with which they make decisions about their work.
- The department articulates a mission that is deeply rooted in the liberal arts and seeks to develop theatre artists, broadly understood.
- Theatre Arts faculty contribute significantly to the university's core offerings, particularly through first-year seminars and Artistic Approaches courses.
- The department collaborates with other programs and schools on campus, including Music and African American Studies.
- Theatre Arts supports students' growth in information literacy and works in close association with Collins Library.
- Changes in course numbering and sequencing reflect clarity of educational purpose, willingness to seek improvement, and strategic planning for achieving goals.
- The department expresses notable dedication to students' development of research and dramaturgy skills.
- Through exit interviews and a survey, the department engages in regular assessment of students' learning and uses the feedback to improve future offerings. We were impressed with the careful attention paid to students' responses, and note the value added by having Profs. Proehl and Smith attend an assessment workshop at PLU.
- Through course offerings, performances, and community collaborations, Theatre Arts demonstrates a deep commitment to having diverse voices speak.

We appreciate the department's responses to our questions about the review document. Even after those points of clarification, however, we note the following:

- Instruction in technical theatre seems to be an ongoing challenge for the department. This was especially clear from the comments by graduating seniors.
- The Curriculum Committee last year affirmed its preference for majors of no more than nine units.

This semester, the Curriculum Committee voted to keep better track of departments' and programs' reasons for exceeding nine units in the major. We append the entirety of the department's response to our question about elective courses, which speaks to the issue of units in the major.

Question from Working Group 4:

Can you explain further how the apparent flexibility in a student's course selection (as well as its potential effect on the distribution of classes within the major) is consistent with a rationale for requiring more courses than the university maximum?

Response from Theatre:

We have, by design, one of the least flexible majors in the university. In this light, even apparent flexibility seems a stretch.

All of our students take the same two course theatre history sequence; all take one class in contemporary theatre (one amongst four rotating offerings that share the same set of learning outcomes); all take the same directing class and two acting classes (one beginning; one advanced, either 300 or 310); all take tech theatre and design; all take the same thesis class.

Compared to the varied lists of classes students can take to complete certain requirements in many majors, this regimen is extremely deliberate. Other than which of two advanced acting classes or which contemporary theatre class they take, students get to make just one choice in the classes they use to satisfy our major requirements: the elective noted above.

At one point, this elective class was also required, a costume class. Ideally, this last elective would still today be costuming or perhaps lighting. For years we advocated, fought for, an increase in our tech/design faculty so that we could sustain this class. In time, after years of advocacy, we gave up – we lost a wonderful costumer to the American University in Egypt, another colleague retired early. Our one elective then is to some extent a function of that loss. As it is, given our faculty's mandated assignment to classes in the core – the equivalent of one full-time position across four lines – elective offerings for students are, compared to many departments, severely limited: one or the other acting class; a playwriting class (when offered by English); Projects in Dramaturgy; a theatre course taken during study abroad (a crucial option since it makes study abroad more possible). We could list this one elective as a course to be chosen amongst offerings A, B, and C, as does Art History, Business, Classics, Communication Studies, English, French Studies, German Studies, History, Philosophy, Studio Art, and others – all majors with ten to fourteen unit requirements, but instead we simply make it an elective.

It seems also that the word elective for the Curriculum Committee implies marginal. That is

not our sense of its meaning. If it would help, we can change the wording to resemble that of other departments.

As it is, we feel that the current arrangement allows students to either expand their interests within a limited set of offerings or to double-down on an area of interest.

Most of all, as noted in our original statement, “With this combination of classes and their participation in co-curricular productions, our students receive a balanced introduction to theatre as a liberal art, but to decrease these fundamental offerings, by even one course, would weaken a major that should, if anything, require one or two more units.”

**Working Group 3 report on the Mathematical Approaches core area review
Curriculum Committee
April, 2015**

Working Group 3 (James Evans, Lisa Ferrari, Alan Krause, Julia Looper, and Tim Pogar) recommends that the Curriculum Committee accepts the Mathematical Approaches core area rubric with no changes from 2011. The working group reviewed the rubric published in the bulletin in the following ways: soliciting feedback from faculty regarding the rubric, reviewing student survey responses about the mathematics core area, and meeting the faculty to discuss concerns.

All faculty who teach in the this core area were asked to review the core rubric and answer whether their students were meeting the learning objectives, in what ways were the students not meeting the learning objectives, how would the faculty change the core objectives or guidelines, and how the current course configuration meets the needs of students who have a limited background in mathematics. We received 6 responses from faculty in the Mathematics and Computer Science Department. The faculty all felt that students are meeting the core course learning objectives (questions 1 and 2.) In answering question 3, faculty commented that they made substantial revision to the core rubric in 2011 that was not reflected in the bulletin. In answer to question 4, the faculty felt that the current courses maintained the appropriate level of rigor.

The student survey from spring of 2014 focused on the Mathematical Approaches requirement. This survey had a 45.5% return rate, and was completed by 322 senior-level students. Seventy percent of the respondents satisfied their Mathematical Approaches requirement in their freshman year. Forty-four percent thought the course they took to fulfill this requirement was more challenging than their most difficult high school math course. Student were asked if taking the core course enhanced their ability to work with numeric data, to reason logically from numeric data, to understand what can and cannot be inferred from data, to understand formal logic, to analyze a problem, to design a systematic way of addressing a problem, to frame a quantitative problem clearly, and to solve a problem using mathematical reasoning. 71.29%, 66.82%, 66.98%, 48.39%, 69.26%, 64.98%, 64.06%, and 67.89%, respectively, answered “very much” or “some.”

At the meeting, the working group and those who taught in the mathematics approaches core area discussed the rubric, how students meet the requirement, and how students were placed in mathematics classes. Mathematics faculty member, Martin Jackson, reviewed the curriculum committee minutes and full faculty meeting minutes from April 2011 and found that the 2011 version of the rubric was approved by both bodies but the curricular statement was not updated. (As a result of this meeting, the curricular statement has been updated.) As we discussed how students meet the mathematics approaches requirement, it became clear that many students are taking the statistics course (Math 160) to fulfill the core requirement and statistics prerequisites for their intended majors. The number of sections taught for this course makes it difficult for the mathematics faculty to develop and

staff new and innovative courses that could fit this core area. Finally, we discussed how students were placed into mathematics courses. The faculty expressed that the math placement exam has some flaws but seems to work reasonably well. The minutes from this meeting are appended to this document.

Based on this data, Working Group 3 feels that the rubric as approved in 2011 meets the needs of the core and the students. We recommend that there be no modifications to the rubric at this time.

To: Faculty Senate
From: James Bernhard, Chairperson LMIS
Concerning: Report LMIS Charges 2014-15
Date: May 11 2015

Dear Colleagues:

The following is a summary of our responses to the Faculty Senate Charges. For further information, I encourage you also to consult the LMIS minutes posted on SoundNet.

For your convenience, I will now address the issues by charge:

1 Charge: *Provide guidance to the library as they implement the Shared Integrated Library System (SILS) Communication Plan.*

During the Sep 9 2014 meeting, Jane Carlin discussed with the committee the implementation of the SILS, which was completed in Jul 2014.

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

LMIS received updates on the implementation of Optimize from Travis Nation, M.K. Smith, William Morse, and Jeremy Cucco during the meetings on Sep 9 2014, Oct 7 2014, Nov 11 2014, and Mar 11 2015. In particular, the committee was kept up to date on the MyPugetSound portal, which went live in Oct 2014, and which has greatly improved the interface to PeopleSoft.

Also, the committee was updated on the move of Admissions to PeopleSoft in Mar 2015, including the many challenges and benefits of this move. During this discussion, the committee was informed that much more data would be available about students applying to the University of Puget Sound. This prompted questions about whether we have campus policies about appropriate use of data, and that matter was discussed further during the Apr 8 2015 LMIS meeting. During that meeting, Ellen Peters and William Morse explained that some policies are already in place but agreed that further policies should be developed. (See the requests for charges below.)

3 Charge: *Continue to monitor the "competency trap" and consider the ways in which our research collections and space might evolve to meet student and faculty needs.*

During the Sep 23 2014 meeting, the committee discussed library plans to create group learning spaces and support new technology. Jane Carlin gave suggestions on ways the library might accomplish these goals. Further updates on how the library is working to achieve these goals were given during the Feb 25 2015 meeting and during the Mar 25

2015 meeting, in which Jane Carlin gave a detailed presentation of library renovations that are being planned, and the committee then discussed these planned renovations.

4 Charge: *Continue to develop a preservation strategy for digital archives of faculty research and university documents.*

The committee did not discuss this charge separately but only in the context of Charge #3.

5 Charge: *Continue to support initiatives to raise awareness and use of the Archives and Special Collections.*

The committee did not discuss this charge.

6 Charge: *Reconsider the 2014 announced process for applying library fines to faculty.*

This charge was our single largest item of business for the year. Because the library fines policy affects faculty so directly and because there is a wide range of views on how fines should be applied, this issue went beyond just the LMIS committee. The committee itself discussed the issue during the meetings on Sep 9 2014, Sep 23 2014, Nov 11 2014, Dec 2 2014, Jan 30 2015, and Feb 25, 2015. As a representative of LMIS, James Bernhard attended the faculty meeting on Nov 11 2014, in which library fines were discussed.

Taking into consideration the discussions within the committee and among the full faculty, Jane Carlin proposed and the committee accepted (on Jan 30 2015) a revision of the library fines policies that includes: a longer loan period, maintaining the proposed billing process without the penalty of late fees (except on ILL/Summit materials), and a provision that emphasizes that Library circulation staff will work closely with individual faculty members to accommodate research needs and exercise flexibility.

7 Charge: *Develop a plan to promote the use of Mahara, an e-portfolio system, both for student experiential learning and for traditional academic information.*

During the Nov 11 2014 meeting, the committee discussed how Mahara might be used more widely on campus. Various suggestions were made, such as: adding Mahara to the myPugetSound portal, having advisors increase awareness of the tool, and getting Career & Employment Services involved in promoting Mahara's use. No concrete plan for increasing Mahara use was developed, however.

8 Charge: *Discuss ways in which LMIS can support collaborative activities on campus such as NW5 digital humanities projects.*

The committee did not discuss this charge.

Because Charge #6 turned out to require much discussion and work on the part of LMIS, the committee did not get to Charges #4, #5, and #8 this year. These seemed like good charges for the committee to have, but they were lower priority than Charge #6.

Requests for future charges:

Based on the committee's discussions of data use in the context of Charge #3, the committee would like to work with IR and TS next year to develop policies to guide and/or govern the appropriate use of data on campus.

Committee size and workload:

The committee seemed to have a suitable number of members for its workload. LMIS needs enough members to fuel discussions, but it does not have a lot of regular subcommittee work that needs to be divided among its members, so more members are not needed.

None of our workload seemed superfluous, and as detailed above, we had more (but not too much more) business than we could attend to during the year.