

Faculty Senate
McCormick Room, Collins Library
Minutes of the February 18, 2019 meeting

Senate Members:

Bryan Thines, Peter Wimberger, Heather Bailey, Andrew Monaco, Kelly Johnson, Heather White, Sara Freeman, Jung Kim, Kris Bartanen, Gwynne Brown, Bill Beardsley, Kristin Johnson, Megan Gessel

Guests: Mike Valentine, Sarah Comstock, Jessica Pense

I. The meeting was called to order at 12:00 pm

II. Announcements

Trans activist and law professor Dean Spade's workshop rescheduled to Feb. 19 3:30-5 pm

School of Music is hiring a new director and has 3 candidates coming to campus for interviews and presentations

III. M/S/P to approve the minutes of January 28, 2019

IV. Updates from ASUPS and Staff Senate

ASUPS:

Event during snow day – game night

Staff Senate:

Continued work on the Student Integrity Code Draft

Annual basket raffle will take place 4/8-4/9 – thoughts for baskets for your area – come, look and shop

Staff expressed appreciation of increased collaboration of staff and students over the years

V. Reports from Standing Committees and CTF

PSC

White shared that PSC expressed a wish to let departments know that many are overdue for review of department guidelines, and that this work needs to be completed (per Faculty Senate charge), and is being met with increased challenges as the committee does not have the department guidelines from those whose reviews are due. While this information was included in the last meeting minutes (Jan. 28), PSC has asked that this reminder be placed in today's meeting as well. (Appendix A)

ASC

Jo Crane, chair of committee has submitted document proposing options regarding Charge #1 from Senate: to review the utility and grading standards of the pass/fail option and, if deemed necessary, recommend policy changes

A more detailed summary of information gathering by ASC and proposed solutions for exploring P/F and CR/NC options moving forward can be found in the appendix (Appendix B).

Some general thoughts:

- Few students opt for P/F notation at present
- How best to define “pass” vs “fail” in terms of corresponding letter grade. For example, at present a D- is considered passing using the grade system, but this same letter grade would be considered failing for a P/F
- Changing the requirements for P/F to reflect C- as passing would place different strains
- The option of changing some courses to CR/NC option in place of P/F might be advantageous from student perspective because of GPA considerations.
- Moving to P/F might encourage students to explore courses outside primary major
- However, CR/NC could not be used to satisfy “fixed” requirements, i.e., courses in major or minor, foreign language, KNOW, etc.
- If faculty are given authority to designate courses as P/F, then students would not have option to request change to letter grade or CR/NC
- Another consideration is that when students complete a course with a “P”, GPA is not affected; however, students who receive an “F” see changes to GPA

Based on the proposal set forth by ASC, several questions remain:

- What are the next steps for moving this conversation forward?
- Should this be added to the agenda for the next senate meeting so discussion regarding proposed options can be explored?
- Should this discussion require some members of ASC to be present at the meeting?
- Does ASC want to have discussion with senate to determine when/how to bring their proposal to senate and full faculty?
- These questions will be corresponded to Jo Crane

CoD

John Lear is chair – Steven Zopfi is co-chair

CTF

Kim shared that CTF had the first listening session hosted by Alisa Kessel and Debbie Chee on Creative Thinking Across the Curriculum that was insightful from the few that were present. In light of concerns raised by some faculty about the timing of the listening sessions and schedule conflicts, Dexter Gordon and Alisa Kessel hope to start meeting with small departments, attending Chairs meetings, and chairs of standing committees in order to ensure all voices are heard across campus and faculty have the opportunity to participate in the process.

Small working groups have been created to explore pathways and how this might work with the current Core. Bartanen further shared the 3 models that were explored by the smaller working groups: Pathways + no Core; Pathways through the Core; and Pathways + Core. These models emerged from faculty input/feedback on the shared drive. At present, CTF is determining ways to narrow down the models from 3 to 2 to bring to the next faculty meeting (March 6) for initial discussion. CTF encourages faculty to continue sharing ideas and concerns via email, shared drive, personal communication with members of CTF, etc.

VI. Student Integrity Code Final Draft

Comstock, Valentine, and Pense discussed the final draft of the student integrity code that has been worked on for the past 18 mos. and has included input from Residence Life, Professional Staff, Security, and others. The need to update the code is due to it being long overdue (23 years) and recent events that necessitate clarification of the code. At present, the updated code has been approved by Staff and ASUPS Senates.

Some key changes from Fall presentation to Senate to now:

- Inclusion of definitions to clarify key terms based on student feedback
- “Retaliation” has been placed in its own separate section
- Section 2A: disorderly and disruptive conduct was clarified to describe what is allowed on campus with respect to student protests and demonstrations. The right to protest and demonstrate is allowed as long as it does not disrupt the educational environment
- In the procedures document, the rights/responsibility portions from each section was pulled out and placed separately for more clarity
- For the record keeping section, the length of time to maintain records on file were changed to 7 years for consistency with other educational documents on campus

The new code is bound to yearly review

Given the timeline of implementation of the code in time for Fall 2019 and the need to present the document to the Board of Trustees during their visit Friday, Feb. 22 and to give the members time to review the documents for full approval in May, Comstock acknowledges that there are ongoing discussions on clarity of language in some areas and that changes are forthcoming. However, given that the code is now bound to yearly review, any and all changes should be carried out fairly easily. ASUPS approved the draft as written with understanding from the Office of Conduct that several areas of the code need clarification and students want continued conversation: 1) Section 2A (disruptive and disorderly conduct), 2) character assassination and what are the legal rights?, and 3) case management – should there be an off-campus adjudicator?

Jason Struna, the faculty rep and 2 other students are continuing to review the 3 questions above and will work with the Office of Conduct to find resolution/compromise on language and policy

Wimberger posed a question regarding how sexual misconduct cases are handled. Specifically, what happens if the respondent and complainant are in the same floor of dorm or class? What mechanisms are in place to protect individuals? In general, while all questions related to student

conduct fall under the integrity document, there are other offices on campus that will adjudicate particular cases. For example, sexual assault cases are handled by the Title IX officer. However, the policies for reporting and process is similar between offices. In the example raised by Wimberger, there are mechanism in place for changes to occur, i.e., changing dorms/floors, changing classrooms.

Pense reminded the Senate that the code refers to many other documents on campus that have policies specific to those areas: weapons, hazing, alcohol and drug, res life, etc.

Freeman asked that given that the code is bound to annual review, does this mean that ASUPS, Staff and Faculty Senates would have to approve changes on annual basis or can the Office of Conduct? If changes are made to the code, then the Board must approve the changes. If changes are made to procedure, then those can be changes administratively. Comstock feels that given the majority of the hard labor was spent drafting the updated code, most, if not all, new changes will be fairly minor and would not require approval from all three entities, i.e., ASUPS, Staff, Faculty.

Wimberger asked Johnson from a student perspective thoughts on the updated code. In general Johnson expressed satisfaction with the updated code with the caveat that discussions around Section 2A will continue. Johnson is appreciative of the university's inclusion of students in the process.

Senate unanimously endorsed the code as the third governing body of the university. The next steps are to make a similar presentation to the Board of Trustees Friday and then to have a final vote at the May meeting via recommendation/discussion from Academic Affairs Committee.

VII. Discuss the idea of an Ad hoc committee on non-tenure line roles

This discussion was started last spring (2018) with focus on analysis and reporting of the role and structures of non-tenure faculty. Freeman asked should an ad hoc committee to examine the structures and timeline of non-tenure be formed?

White reminded the senate that this topic emerged from the last senate meeting in spring 2018. It is most likely that chairs of programs and departments do not share a systemic understanding of the role of non-tenure faculty, and that there is not a standard protocol for how non-tenure positions are configured. Therefore, given the disparity across campus on how non-tenured faculty are used, and an apparent inequity of how non-tenure faculty positions are configured and the role of those serving in this role, discussion of this topic should be given thoughtful consideration.

Alisa Kessel provided a document to the senate that summarized conversations she had with non-tenure faculty in Spring 2018 for consideration during the 2018-2019 session

Given this, Freeman asked broadly whether this is an area that tenure line faculty are interested in. Gessel expressed that Chemistry faculty are very interested in this conversation because of

how these positions affect the department, in particular questions around how students are affected from being taught by non-tenure faculty and how long non-tenure faculty are able to stay on campus

Brown also shared that music has affiliate faculty who teach studio lessons.

Bartanen shared that Julie Christoph is continuing the work started by Martin Jackson last year to clarify and establish some term positions for those in the visiting line. Perhaps the best approach is to invite Julie to share her findings with the senate, and from this conversation form a plan on how best to move forward. While this will not happen in time for the next senate meeting, Freeman will reach out to Julie for other meeting times. Freeman also suggests that given the timeline of the senate with other issues such as student evaluations of teaching that need to be urgently addressed, perhaps the best approach for now is to focus on information gathering from Julie and then discuss next steps during the senate retreat in August 2019. Given the current work of the CTF, this topic most likely will dovetail nicely with that work and offer more clarity for next steps

VIII. Other Business

Johnson pointed out that there are some issues with the academics (pugetsound.edu/academics) link on the Puget Sound website. Amy Fisher noticed that some of the links on the website were incomplete and this is problematic given the work of the CTF and what the public is viewing when on the Puget Sound website. While the mistakes on the page were corrected, the 'academics' page in general is not very attractive and seems in need of revision. Who is in charge of maintaining the page and who is the contact person for requesting changes? Is this something faculty can do themselves? Johnson will contact Gayle McIntosh to start initial round of conversations and report back to Senate at the next meeting.

IX. Meeting adjourned at 1:00 pm

Minutes prepared by Jung Kim

Appendix A: Review Cycle for Departmental Evaluation Standards

Professional Standards Committee

<p>Year One (first review in Spring 2017) EPDM (fall) History (spring) Economics (spring)</p>	<p>Year Two (first review in 2017-18) Classics – deferred to Fall 2018 German Studies (fall) – overdue Geology (spring) – overdue Hispanic Studies (spring) – deferred to Fall 2018</p>
<p>Year Three (first review in 2018-19) Religious Studies (fall) – overdue Exercise Science (fall) – overdue Psychology (spring) – due Sociology & Anthropology (spring) – due</p>	<p>Year Four (first review in 2019-2020) STS (fall) African American Studies (fall) Theatre Arts (spring) Chemistry (spring)</p>
<p>Year Five (first review in 2020-2021) IPE (fall) Education (fall) Communication Studies (spring) Asian Languages & Cultures (spring)</p>	<p>Year Six (first review in 2021-2022) Physics (fall) Politics & Government (fall) Music (spring) Math & Computer Science (spring)</p>
<p>Year Seven (first review in 2022-2023) Philosophy (fall) Biology (fall) Business and Leadership (spring) English (spring)</p>	<p>Year Eight (first review in 2023-2024) Physical Therapy (fall) French Studies (fall) Occupational Therapy (spring) Art & Art History (spring)</p>

Appendix B: Charge #1 from the Faculty Senate (“to review the utility and grading standards of the pass/fail option and, if deemed necessary, recommend policy changes”)

Background/Discussion:

The reason for a P/F is to encourage exploration; however, very few students use the P/F, ~10 per year.

We reviewed regional and peer institutions policies on P/F in terms of what constitutes a passing score, restrictions of who qualifies for P/F, and impact on the student’s GPA.

We decided that there is an inconsistency in the current policy. Using the Graded option, a D- is considered passing, however, using the P/F option, a C- is required to pass. The C- requirement does create an incentive for students to put in a fair amount of effort. If changed to a D- then the amount of effort could be too low, with negative externalities on the class.

The P/F system could be changed to credit/no credit where neither would be included in the GPA. Anything below a C- would lead to no credit but would not be factored in the student’s GPA.

By excluding the no credit option from the GPA, there may be students who avoid being placed on academic probation (compared to the P/F option, where F does get included as a 0 in the GPA).

The potential negative effects of the changes were considered to be, on balance, fairly minor.

Questions/Possible Solutions:

Should we keep P/F notation on transcript for mandatory pass-fail courses (where there is no graded option) as well as separate P/NP notation for optional courses with the current proposal under discussion? Some concerns about possible confusion about this distinction were raised. The option of eliminating the P/F option entirely was discussed, as well as using a Credit/No Credit distinction (with notation of CR/NC on the transcript) to avoid confusion and overlap of Pass/No Pass with Pass/Fail.

After discussing these issues, the committee came up with a *modified proposal, which entails essentially 3 different “tiers” of classes that are not assigned letter grades:*

- 1) *Mandatory P/F academic classes* (e.g., certain music courses and others, where P/F is the only option for these courses), which would continue to use the P/F notation on transcripts.
- 2) *P/F activity courses* (such as varsity sports and P.E. courses), which would also continue to use the P/F notation.
- 3) *Credit/No Credit course option*, which would use the CR/NC notation on transcripts, and which would not count toward the GPA. These courses would require a C- or above to receive credit for the course, and students could take a maximum of 4 units using the CR/NC option.

For classes covered under #1 and #2 above, there would be no option for students to petition to switch these courses either to a letter-graded option or to the Credit/No Credit option.

Also, for the courses covered under #1 and #2, it would be up to each department/program to determine the desired criteria for P/F (e.g., D-, C-, or perhaps some other threshold), which individual instructors within the department/program would then apply, making sure that the passing criterion is clearly stated in syllabi for students.

Individual instructors (in consultation with the requirements and guidelines of their respective departments and programs) would reserve the right to decide whether certain courses were not eligible for the P/F or CR/NC options. The course proposal forms (from the Curriculum Committee) may need to be revised to include the CR/NC option and departments/programs/instructors should review these forms (annually?) for each course to see that they reflect the desired grading options.

CR/NC and P/F Grading

System of Permanent Grades

Courses at the university of Puget Sound use one of two possible grading systems: (1) Courses that assign letters grades on an A through F scale and (2) courses that assign Pass or Fail grades. Most academic courses are offered on the letter-grading system. Activity courses and a small number of academic courses are offered on the Pass/Fail system. As discussed below, courses on the letter-grading system may be taken on a Credit/No Credit basis. Pass/Fail courses cannot be taken on a Credit/No Credit basis.

Letter Grade	Grade Points
A	4.00
A-	3.67
B+	3.33
B	3.00
B-	2.67
C+	2.33
C	2.00
C-	1.67
D+	1.33
D	1.00
D-	0.67
F	0.00

Credit (CR)	Not computed in grade point average
No Credit (NC)	Not computed in grade point average
Pass (P)	Not computed in grade point average
Fail (F)	Equivalent to a F letter grade and computed in grade point average accordingly
Audit (AU)	Not computed in grade point average

Credit/No Credit Grading (Student Option)

Unless otherwise restricted, a student may choose to take a letter-graded course with a Credit/No Credit (CR/NC) option. The Credit/No Credit option is designed to encourage students to explore courses in academic areas outside of the major or minor. Therefore, courses taken with the Credit/No Credit option are not calculated into the student's grade point average. If the professor submits a letter grade of C- or higher the student will receive credit for the course; if the professor submits a letter grade of D+ or lower the student will not receive credit for the course.

Credit/No Credit registrations are not reported to the instructor; however, an instructor may prohibit the Credit/No Credit option or may limit the number of students who may enroll using the Credit/No Credit option. Students who wish to exercise the Credit/No Credit option must do so at the Office of the Registrar on or before the last day to add a class. After the add period, the grading option cannot be changed.

A student may elect to take one academic course with the Credit/No Credit grading option each semester in their junior and senior year. A maximum of 4.0 Credit/No Credit units can be applied to the 32.00 units required for graduation.

A course taken with the Credit/No Credit option cannot satisfy:

1. University Core requirements
2. Major/Minor degree requirements
3. Foreign Language graduation requirement
4. Upper-Division graduation requirement
5. KNOW requirement
6. Graduate degree requirements

Pass-Fail Courses (Faculty Designation)

Courses that do not assign letter grades are designated as Pass/Fail (P/F) Courses. Pass/Fail is a faculty designation for a course. Pass/Fail courses may not be taken for a letter grade or as Credit/No Credit. The instructor of the course shall establish the criteria for the determination of passing and failing the course and shall include that information in the syllabus. Students who pass the course will receive credit for the course but no adjustment will be made to the grade point average. Students who fail the course will receive no credit for the course and 0.0 grade points will be included in their grade point average.

A maximum of 2.0 *activity* Pass/Fail units can be applied to the 32.00 units required for graduation.