

Faculty Senate Minutes
Misner Room
September 26, 2011

Present:

Senators: Steven Neshyba (chair), Fred Hamel, Amy Spivey, Tiffany Aldrich MacBain, Krista Kotzsis, Ross Singleton, Gareth Barkin, Marcus Luther, Keith Ward, Bill Barry, Alisa Kessel, Leslie Saucedo, Kelli Delaney, Kris Bartanen, Mike Segawa. Guests: Rich Anderson-Connolly, Lynnette Claire, Jeff Grinstead

The meeting came to order at 4:02. Minutes from the September 12th meeting were approved with minor revisions. No announcements.

Special Orders:

Hamel raised concern for lawn mowing near academic buildings during class time. A brief discussion ensued regarding remedies. Dean Bartanen offered to talk to Sherry Mondou.

Neshyba indicated that the Faculty Salary Committee (FSC) wants to meet with the Senate, and that FSC recommendations to the Budget Task Force are given in October. Spivey noted a faculty member's comment at the Faculty meeting about giving up a 1% raise to preserve sabbaticals or faculty positions and asked how faculty might come to agreement or vote on this. Bartanen clarified that the university's long-range budget plan assumes increases that include inflation + 1%, so the 1% is above and beyond inflation. Saucedo concurred with Spivey's question. Singleton commented that Economics will be hiring for a tenure track position soon, and the starting salary for this position will be about \$15,000 below market for undergrad programs in economics. Economics has lost top faculty candidates in the past to schools that pay more. Singleton argued that dropping 1% could have differential effects across the university and for specific departments. The long term quality of specific programs is an issue going forward. Barry suggested the issue may involve adjusting the current salary scale index. Neshyba will put the FSC report on the Senate agenda.

Charges to the Academic Standards Committee:

The Senate completed its charges for the ASC. No new items were added to the charges from the September 12 meeting.

Report from ad hoc Committee on Educational Benefits

The committee reported on its work and received questions. Members have worked with Dean Bartanen, President Thomas and Sherry Mondou and are submitting a new model to replace the Northwest Independent Colleges (NIC) exchange (see Attachments_A, B, and C). A next step is to calculate the proposal cost; a consultant who specializes in such work has been hired to support the Benefits Task Force (BenTF). The BenTF is sponsoring a forum with Jim Swartz, a professor and former dean from Grinnell College who participated in designing a revised exchange model for the Associated Colleges of the Midwest (ACM).

Senator questions were fielded by Lynnette Claire and Rich Anderson-Connolly, members of the Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Benefits:

Who would be eligible? Answer: For all hired previous to July 1, 2011, there is a 1-year wait period; for new hires there will be a 5-year waiting period. A key piece of data for the actuary is how many people exist who would take advantage of the benefit.

Ward: We need participating colleges, but who would these be? Answer: We are looking for a minimum of three schools— including Puget Sound. We are working on this and open to new schools beyond our former NIC partners. ACM has not shown interest in having us join their consortium. Other NIC schools have been contacted, and the responses of Willamette and Whitman have been the most promising.

Neshyba: How is the ad hoc committee's relationship with BenTF? Answer: Jill Nealey-Moore is the BenTF liaison. We see the ad hoc committee's role as putting forth a new model. President Thomas ultimately wants the recommendation to come from the BenTF. There are some issues with representing staff interest, making all voices heard in this decision. We have seen the ad hoc committee's charge as finding a replacement for the NIC exchange – not to run the numbers. For example, we are not necessarily looking for a “budget-neutral” model but are putting forth a model that seems like a fair replacement to what was promised to faculty. We want something done this year – especially for faculty whose kids are caught between models. We want the administration talking to other schools. The BenTF final report is set to go to the Board in May.

Barry: Are you concerned that by May, urgency for these education benefits will subside? Answer: The work of the ad hoc committee has already had positive effects, and the BenTF is responding to our ideas. This issue won't fade, because our children will not fade. Faculty with kids in high school would like this benefit in place.

Claire asked the Senate whether the committee should hold open forum sessions to get input and feedback. Barry responded that one way would be to hold such a forum during an upcoming faculty meeting. Anderson-Connolly noted that Jim Swartz will be here on Oct. 3rd, and his talk will have a public comment component.

Kessel: What about a cash benefit for non-exchange schools? Answer: In the tuition exchange model advocated by the ad hoc committee, there is a cash exchange option. But there are two documents: one describes a revised exchange, and one is for Puget Sound's overall benefit. The latter does include a cash grant for those for whom liberal arts education is not a fit. This option will possibly be based on half of UW tuition, although state tuition is going up quickly, so this solution may not be viable.

Kessel: What about variable tuition costs across exchange schools? Will this matter? Won't some schools pay more? Answer: Not so much. ACM has a wide range of schools, and variable tuition hasn't

been an issue. The university would be asking for a consortial agreement for any participant, so colleges would have to meet the minimum requirements. Also, tuition costs across NIC schools are not dramatically different.

Singleton: Is the committee proposing anything with regard to staff benefits? Answer: We are not. The staff liaison took the idea of a cash benefit to the Staff Senate, but the ad hoc committee does not see staff benefits as part of its charge. Our goal has been to replace the NIC.

Barkin: Will the 50% requirement make it possible for participating institutions to remain in balance? Answer: In theory we would be losing 8% of tuition (50% less the estimated discount rate of 42%). But we see a strategic benefit in how an exchange helps deepen ties between faculty of different schools.

Barry: What about the factor of differential sizes of faculty & staff between schools like Puget Sound and Whitman? Answer: Differentials in the ACM are even bigger and the consortium is viable. Jim Swartz may be able to address this issue.

Neshyba offered the sincere thanks of the Senate to the ad hoc committee for its hard work.

Discussion of Academic Standard Committee (ASC)'s questions on uncharged work:

Ward opened with comments on the previous year, in which "communication broke down at many levels." The breakdown stemmed from a specific situation in which the Senate rescinded the ASC's work on the Incomplete Policy. Ward, Neshyba, and others were able to talk with ASC members about the problem and to hear how the Senate action was received. Ward believes that the incident was unfortunate but isolated and so not a chronic or structural issue that requires assessment by the ASC of their role. Nothing has changed in the bylaws, which provide guidance on committee work.

Nonetheless, Neshyba encouraged more active liaison reporting back from the ASC. He re-charged Senate liaisons to be aware and in touch with committees and committee chairs. Some discussion of the role of Senate liaisons followed. Ward suggested that liaisons should be in touch with motions that have substantive importance, bringing them to the Senate's attention. Saucedo observed that some liaisons attend every meeting, others never, and asked for clarification. Singleton felt that expecting Senators to attend committee meetings may be a burden and also may change dynamics of a committee. He suggested building a relationship with the chair through holding direct meetings or phone conversations. Barry finds it useful to go to meetings; one advantage is being able to talk to committee members directly. Barry further noted that the Senate should be extremely careful in rescinding committee work; an alternative is to go back to the committee for further clarification.

Spivey asked what responses the Senate has to the direct questions asked by the ASC (p. 8 of ASC 2010-11 Year-End Report). Bartanen noted that answering these questions could be helpful for other committees. Neshyba said that if a new issue comes up, and the committee wants to take it up, he would prefer the committee ask the Senate to charge them on the issue. Spivey invited the Senate to

provide a single response to the ASC questions in a way that might apply to other committees as well. Neshyba suggested that such a response be drafted by the Senate Executive Committee. Hamel encouraged the executive committee to attend carefully to the by-laws, as it may not be appropriate to require committees to request being charged by the Senate. Singleton agreed that such a policy could make things unnecessarily bureaucratic. Committees have legitimate leeway to make policy that may or may not include the Senate, other than as a reviewing body or sounding board. Luther noted that asking committees to request formal charges may move things too slowly if an item has to go through the Senate. Ward reiterated that there are elements within the bylaws that enable us to function effectively. Spivey returned to the importance of healthy interaction and communication between Senate and committees in the policy making process. Bartanen suggested that drafting language on liaisons might be combined with drafting clarifications on uncharged work. Saucedo offered the idea of “mid-year charges” as a middle ground recommendation. Language will be drafted by the executive committee.

Proposal on 1st Year Seminars:

M/S [Barry/Spivey] to endorse proposed revisions of first-year seminars endorsed by the Curriculum Committee (See Attachments D and E). Barry reviewed the rationale for changes: 1) guidelines for writing & rhetoric seminars seemed overly prescriptive and accessible only to Communications Studies and English; 2) currently seminars are not linked sequentially in any way; 3) students face challenges with information literacy & research. The new proposal offers a common set of guidelines, is more accessible, includes sequencing, and involves information literacy.

Spivey noted that participants in the Burlington Northern first-year seminar were a diverse group of faculty from across campus who have taught first-year seminars. The group was mindful of how much work it would take faculty to transition to the new rubric. Spivey felt that she could take her current first year course and re-design it for either seminar 1 or seminar 2, which is a strength of the new design.

MacBain asked if there was room to teach one year-long course – to teach both parts with the same students. Answer: The committee saw this as possible, but not the norm. One issue would be students committing to both semesters.

Singleton expressed concern that Seminar 2 would be the harder of the two to teach because it requires a substantive scholarly paper. Would a second-semester freshman be in position to do a substantive scholarly paper within a discipline?. What kinds of analytical devices would they have at hand to flesh out an issue? Barry responded that the idea is not to expect a first-year project to be a senior project but rather to help students develop initial skills. Spivey said that in her SCS seminar on energy, students do a big energy paper, but she can't assume any necessary background or math skills, so the research differs from those of physics majors. Luther commented that flexibility should stay intact with first year seminars. Segawa said that the Burlington Northern group may need to clarify its definition of “substantive work” and what this means for first-year students. Kotzsis finds that first-year students are able to look at primary sources and that the topic should be secondary to the teaching of skills outlined in the rubric.

Ward asked how the revision would affect transfer students. Would they be required to take both courses in sequence, and how might this affect transfer policy? Barry said the idea is that transfer students would be required to take both courses, though the Curriculum Committee would need to work with the transfer reviewer to consider how outside courses would be evaluated in relation to the new seminar requirements.

The Senate agreed to continue discussion of the motion on October 10th. The first-year seminar committee would like to bring the proposal to the October 12th faculty meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 5:34.

Respectfully Submitted.

Fred Hamel
Meeting Scribe

Tiffany Aldrich MacBain
Faculty Senate Secretary

Attachment A

DATE

To: Kris Bartanen, Academic Vice President
Fr: Ad Hoc Committee on Education Benefits
Re: Tuition exchange models

As you know, many members of the faculty are concerned by the collapse of the Northwest colleges' tuition exchange program, and many would like to see our campus leadership make efforts to rebuild the old tuition exchange or to find new exchange partners for Puget Sound.

We ask you to take ownership of this issue on behalf of the faculty, who need your leadership on this issue. Discussions of this issue held entirely within the "budget neutrality" framework that guides the Benefits Task Force excludes consideration of critical values that do not show up in the "spreadsheets" that shape decision making on this issue. Consideration of these values is important to faculty and they need to be voiced in cabinet-level discussions of this issue.

We suspect that your peers at some of the northwest colleges are also interested in these issues, and know for example that the provost at Whitman has been participating directly in the committee looking at Whitman's education benefits program. We wonder if discussions at Puget Sound and among the decision makers who chose to walk away from the Northwest exchange made a careful consideration of the following issues:

Faculty recruitment and retention, particularly of pre-tenure colleagues.

Faculty morale. A significant number of faculty members were told that the exchange was a guaranteed benefit of employment here, and the loss of the exchange is a real blow. We ask you to look up and down the list of signers of the faculty petition and to note the number of people who don't have children, or whose children have long since graduated from college.

The exchange relationship could serve as a basis for strengthening academic ties among the northwest colleges, or with other institutional partners. The ACM exchange was saved in part because participating institutions saw the exchange

program as part of a larger set of relationships with other ACM institutions. Perhaps the work of rebuilding this exchange and affirming the importance of this relationship can lead to productive interactions among the campuses and cooperation for mutual benefit on other matters of common concern.

Quality and character of the educational experience at Puget Sound. The failure of the Northwest exchange and its replacement with a relatively small cash benefit will increase the propensity of faculty to have their sons and daughters come to Puget Sound as a (or “the”) free educational option. We know that this is a great college, but wonder how healthy it will be for campus culture to have a spike in the number of faculty/staff dependents enrolling here. We will end up enrolling more students who don’t necessarily fit well here, and frankly it’s not always comfortable and easy to handle student-teacher relationships with the sons and daughters of colleagues and staff. Moreover, imagine the morale problems that will flow from the rejection of significant numbers of faculty and staff dependents’ applications for admission. Worst case: Jane is admitted to Willamette or Whitman and denied admission to Puget Sound.

Attachment B

**University of Puget Sound
Tuition Benefit Proposal
August 2011**

Problem Statement

After more than 30 years of delivering an important benefit to the employees of Lewis and Clark, Puget Sound, Reed, Whitman, and Willamette, the Northwest Independent Colleges Tuition Exchange Program will end in 2015. Ultimately this system failed because it relied upon a rough balance of student exchanges between every pairing of schools. This document offers a proposal for a restructured tuition exchange program (TEP), retention of the Puget Sound tuition remission, retention of the National Tuition Exchange, and a cash benefit for post-secondary education outside the exchanges.

Goal

Provide a high-quality education benefit for Puget Sound faculty, staff and their dependents.

Education Benefit Proposal

Create a hybrid tuition exchange that maintains the benefit faculty and staff consistent with the tradition of high-quality education benefit.

This exchange relies on the following elements:

- Importing college grants 50% tuition remission (identified as a discounted tuition).
- Exporting college must provide between 80-100% of the discounted tuition (40-50% of full tuition). In the Puget Sound tradition, we would expect the University to offer full coverage of discounted tuition to Puget Sound families.
- If a participating college does not provide the full-tuition benefit any financial aid is applied to the family's portion of tuition.
- Families are responsible for all non-tuition expenses (e.g., room and board, fees, books)

| | | |
|-------------------------|--------|------------------|
| Importing school | 50% | \$19,255 |
| Exporting school | 40-50% | \$15,404-19, 255 |
| Family's responsibility | 0-10% | \$0-3,851 |
| Full tuition | | \$38,510 |

- No cap on the number of TEP awards to entering first year students will be permitted.
- Students attending their home college will not be included in the TEP program. The home college will admit and provide tuition remission benefits to students from employee families under its own institutional guidelines.
- We will retain our membership in the National Tuition Exchange and our Puget Sound tuition remission benefit.
- For those dependents for whom a liberal arts education will not meet their needs, a cash benefit option equivalent to 50% of University of Washington's tuition will be made available.

Outcomes

- Adoption of this proposal would signal a reaffirmation of commitment to providing meaningful educational benefit to Puget Sound families.
- Offers an opportunity to manifest our institutional commitment to liberal arts education by making it possible for our faculty and staff to send their children to liberal arts colleges.
- Attract and retain talented faculty and staff.
- Provides employer-institutions higher level of control over benefit, including enhanced predictability of costs.
- Strengthen relationships between campuses that offers an opportunity for faculty and programmatic collaboration.

Next Steps

- In order to adopt this plan, we your need leadership and support with faculty, staff, administration and peer institutions.
 - To help faculty understand the proposal
 - To help present the proposal to the cabinet and president
 - To build support among peer institutions starting with NIC members and beyond to create an effective coalition
- Because time is running out on the limited NIC exchange, this issue needs to be quickly and effectively addressed.

Attachment C

A Model Tuition Exchange Program (TEP) (Proposed Replacement for NIC) August 2011

Background

After more than 30 years of delivering an important benefit to the employees of Lewis and Clark, Puget Sound, Reed, Whitman, and Willamette, the Northwest Independent Colleges Tuition Exchange Program will end in 2015. Ultimately this system failed because it relied upon a rough balance of student exchanges between every pairing of schools. This document offers a proposal for a restructured tuition exchange, one that corrects the weaknesses in the old program, and thus continues to provide the valuable benefit to families in the Northwest Independent Colleges.

Elements of the Model Tuition Exchange Program

To participate in the TEP member institutions must agree to follow the principles established in this document.

Each college will grant 50% tuition remission to the other participants in the TEP. That is, each Importing College will charge one-half of its full tuition to the Exporting College. In this document, 50% of the Importing College's full tuition will be referred to as its discounted tuition.

Each Exporting College will determine the level of benefit it offers its employees, though it must be at least 80% of the Importing College's discounted tuition (or 40% of the Importing College's full tuition). If the Exporting College benefit is 80%, the family will be responsible for the remaining 20% of discounted tuition (plus any additional fees, room, board, etc.). The Exporting College might choose a benefit of 90% or 100% or any other level as long as it is at least 80% of the discounted tuition of the Importing College.

To make clear the meaning of the previous two points, let us consider an example. The full tuition of an Importing College is \$50,000. The discounted tuition is thus \$25,000. If the Exporting College covers 80% of discounted tuition, the Exporting College pays \$20,000 (80% of \$25,000) to the Importing College. The student (family) pays \$5,000 (20% of \$25,000) to the Importing College.

Eligibility for the TEP will continue to be determined by the Exporting College. Criteria may include, for example, the number of years of service prior to eligibility in the exchange.

Students who want to receive TEP benefits will identify themselves when they apply to a TEP college.

The Importing College will invoice the Exporting College for its share of the tuition bill. The Importing College will invoice the student/family for their share of the tuition and other costs.

Ordinarily, students will have TEP benefits for four academic years. Students will be entitled to four years of benefits even if they take a leave from college for one or several years. If an enrolled TEP student chooses to take a leave of absence, the student may want to obtain documents from both the Importing and Exporting institutions stating the remaining TEP benefit they will receive on their return.

No cap on the number of TEP awards to entering first year students will be permitted.

Participation in the TEP does not preclude participation in other exchange programs (e.g., the national Tuition Exchange) nor does it prevent institutions from offering additional tuition assistance or benefits (e.g., a cash benefit for schools outside the exchange).

Exporting Colleges may structure the benefit in different ways as long as they provide at least 80% of the discounted tuition of the Importing College.

Transition to New TEP

The new TEP will become operational starting in the fall semester that follows the agreement of at least three of the five current NIC institutions. Institutions that join the new exchange will give notice of their decision to withdraw from the old exchange in 60 days.

Institutions in the old exchange that do not immediately join the new exchange will be free to join the exchange starting in any subsequent academic year.

The new TEP program will begin with a clean slate with no adjustment for past balances.

Off-Campus Study

Colleges will provide the Tuition Remission benefit for students participating in off-campus and study abroad programs sponsored or operated by the college in which the TEP student is enrolled (the Importing College).

Students Attending the Home College

Students attending their home college will not be included in the TEP program. The home college will admit and provide tuition remission benefits to students from employee families under its own institutional guidelines.

Outside Financial Aid

The Importing College will ask TEP students to apply for all aid they might qualify for. State and federal aid ordinarily will be credited to the tuition or educational costs paid by the family, if any.

External aid will be credited in accordance with the following guidelines:

- Students may receive state aid in addition to TEP benefits up to the cost of tuition.
- Students may receive Federal Pell Grant(s) in addition to TEP benefits, up to federal financial need or the cost of tuition, whichever is greater.
- Taking into account guidelines 1) and 2), the Importing College will administer private scholarships and other aid according to its usual institutional policies which factor in family contribution, cost of education and other relevant issues. The Importing College will also be able to award institutional merit aid and additional need-based aid according to institutional policies.

If the Tuition Remission agreement triggers violations of NCAA guidelines or federal/state regulations, the Importing College will determine how the grant funds are credited.

Addition of New Institutions

Colleges and universities not included in the original five may join the TEP with majority approval of the current members. Enlargement of the exchange is encouraged as a means to increase the value of the education benefit to the employees without substantially altering the cost to the member institutions. We expect that all members of the original consortium would be interested in expanding the exchange.

Attachment D

To: Curriculum Committee and faculty members at the University of Puget Sound

From: Burlington Northern First-Year Seminar Faculty Working Group (Bill Barry, Derek Buescher, Peggy Burge, Julie Nelson Christoph, Andrew Gardner, Kent Hooper, Renée Houston, Priti Joshi, Kriszta Kotsis, Sunil Kukreja, Julie Neff-Lippman, Eric Orlin, Amy Spivey, Ariela Tubert)

Purpose

This memorandum accompanies the proposed new rubrics for the first-year seminars (FYS) at the University of Puget Sound. It

- explains the background and process behind creation of the proposed new FYS rubrics;
- explains the strengths and weaknesses of the current FYS structure; and
- explains how the proposed change alleviates the weaknesses of the current FYS structure.

Background

Assessments of the Writing and Rhetoric and Scholarly and Creative Inquiry Seminars over the past eight years have revealed consistent support for the basic concept of the seminars –as well as some consistent strains of dissatisfaction among faculty and students alike about the clarity and feasibility of course objectives. The regular review of core areas by the Curriculum Committee (as reported in the Curriculum Committee Working Group *Report on Freshman Seminars* of April 21, 2010) reports on the survey of and discussion with faculty teaching the FYS. The report notes that the majority of faculty who provided feedback were satisfied with their delivery of specific seminars. However, the report acknowledged a number of weaknesses in the current system, which are detailed below. In student focus groups as part of The Study of Writing at Puget Sound (2007), Puget Sound seniors reported their perception that the student experience of the FYS was highly uneven from section to section.

After meeting during 2010- 2011 in one-on-one informal interviews and open invitation focus groups with faculty members teaching FYS, Julie Christoph proposed and received a Burlington Northern grant for two summer workshops focused on reviewing assessments and considering structural and/or curricular revisions to the seminars. Workshop participants included faculty members from a variety of disciplines who teach FYS as well as librarians from Collins Library. Workshop participants met for three days in June and three days in August 2011, reviewing Puget Sound assessments of the FYS and the first-year experience in residential seminars and information literacy, longitudinal assessments of writing over the four years at Puget Sound, as well as staffing trends in the seminars over the past eight years (attending to department and to ongoing vs. contract faculty). The two workshop groups also looked at models for first-year academic programs at all of our comparison institutions, reviewed relevant best practices statements by the Council of Writing Program Administrators and by the American Library Association, research on adolescent brain development, and longitudinal studies of college student writing development. The workshop culminated in the writing of the proposed new rubrics.

Strengths of the Current FYS Structure

The Burlington Northern First-Year Seminar Working Group notes the following strengths of the current FYS structure:

- small classes that provide high levels of interaction between students and faculty and among students;
- the opportunity to academically examine topics to which students otherwise might not be exposed; and

- development of skills pertinent to academic inquiry—argument analysis and production as well as reading, writing and speaking ability.

Weaknesses of the Current FYS Structure

The Curriculum Committee Working Group *Report on Freshman Seminars* reports the following from their survey of faculty members teaching FYS:

- **Too much content:** "many [Writing and Rhetoric] faculty noted that balancing and doing justice to all three learning objectives as well as adequately covering the substantive topic of the seminar was difficult in the time they had."
- **Preparation differentials in students:** "a smaller number of [Scholarly and Creative Inquiry] faculty noted that inadequate knowledge of the topic and the variability in the level of preparation among some students tended to adversely affect the intellectual quality of the seminar experience."
- **Spring term variance of student preparation:** Faculty members teaching both types of seminars reported challenges teaching in the Spring semester because of variability in delivery of and preparation provided by Fall semester seminars. (See the *Report on Freshman Seminars* and Curriculum Committee minutes of November 9, 2009).

The Burlington Northern FYS Working Group also discussed the weaknesses of the current FYS system noting that, while the current system provides several pedagogical benefits, both student learning and faculty delivery may be enhanced with a number of changes. The primary weaknesses identified include the following:

- **Lack of connection across semesters:** There is currently no relationship between the Writing and Rhetoric (WR) course of study and the Scholarly and Creative Inquiry (SCI) course of study. This lack of relationship is exacerbated by the lack of sequencing in the current FYS structure. The SCI and WR seminars do not function together to provide a coherent and consistent introduction to academic inquiry nor do they provide a logical development of skills necessary for participation in that inquiry. In particular,
 - the lack of "flow" between terms increases student perception of the FYS as "hoops" to be jumped through, and
 - offering both types of seminars in each term means that faculty have no consistent foundation upon which to build in the Spring term. The result is that faculty may be repeating material and/or simply attempting to cover too much.
- **Insufficient information literacy training:** Information literacy is a central component of entering an academic community and the working group believes that it should be incorporated into the FYS experience in a consistent way—not only to serve student needs, but also in response to accreditation requirements. Results from the "Research Practices Survey," a national instrument taken by our entering first-year students since 2006, show that most of our students begin college with little experience with research and demonstrate little understanding of basic research terms, tools, and strategies:
 - 92 percent indicate that Google was their primary research tool
 - Only 57 percent had ever used an online library catalog
 - Only 50 percent had ever used a subscription database
 - Just 21 percent could correctly define a peer-reviewed journal
 - When shown three citations, 59 percent could correctly identify a book, 23 percent a journal, and 12 percent an essay within a book

- Moreover, once students do arrive on campus, they receive inconsistent levels of information literacy instruction; a Puget Sound academic review of the library during the spring of 2011, as well as the NWCCU Evaluator's Report of April 2009, specifically noted the lack of a systematic integration of information literacy into the curriculum.

Benefits of the Proposed FYS Rubrics

Under the new proposed rubrics, the seminars would be taught as a two-semester sequence with explicit attention to academic tools in each semester, moving from more instructor-guided assignments in the first semester to more independent assignments in the second semester. The proposed rubrics offer the following benefits:

- Retains small class size: The proposed rubrics maintain both the small class size and the ability of individual instructors to select a topical focus, resulting in a higher level of interest for the faculty members teaching and the students taking the course.
- Retains emphasis on academic abilities: The proposed rubrics retain the emphasis on argument production and analysis and critical reading, writing, and speaking appropriate to an academic context, but the expectations for explicit instruction in these academic abilities is more clearly spread across both semesters.
- Sequencing benefits for students: Sequencing the seminars will assist student learning and development as they enter the academic community. For example, students will learn to analyze texts and other sources provided by the instructor before they are asked to find sources of their own using library resources.
- Culminating research project: Sequencing the seminars offers a culminating research project for all first year students. This project will ensure that all first year students will gain an introduction to basic research skills as preparation for their ongoing academic careers. The sequencing and final project develops an appreciation for the challenges and rewards of academic inquiry.
- Sequencing benefits for faculty: Sequencing the seminars provides faculty a clearer understanding of both what to offer students in each term and what students should have received in each term, Sequencing the course objectives means faculty may devote appropriate time to appropriate material with less concern about student preparation (understanding, of course, that students learn at different rates and come to campus with a variety of preparatory backgrounds).
- Greater faculty accessibility: The guidelines in the proposed rubrics are more broadly accessible to faculty members across the disciplines than those in the current WR and SCI rubrics.
- Addresses information literacy: To address the lack of uniformity in information literacy training being received by Puget Sound students, the guidelines in the proposed rubrics include specific language about the information literacy skills recommended for first-year students by the Collins Library librarians.

Attachment E

Seminar in Scholarly Inquiry I and II Proposed Objectives and Guidelines

September 2, 2011

Learning Objectives

The First-Year Seminars at Puget Sound introduce students into an academic community and engage them in the process of scholarly inquiry.

In these discussion-based seminars, students develop the intellectual habits necessary to write and speak effectively and with integrity. Students increase their ability to develop effective arguments by learning to frame questions around a focused topic, to assess and support claims, and to present their work to an academic audience both orally and in writing. As part of understanding scholarly conversations, students learn to identify the most appropriate sources of information and to evaluate those sources critically. Over the course of two seminars, students—with increasing independence—contribute to these conversations and produce a substantive scholarly project.

In the first Seminar in this sequence, students engage challenging texts and ideas through guided inquiry led by the faculty member. Students begin to develop the academic abilities of reading, writing, and oral argument necessary to enter into academic conversations. Assignments in this seminar largely involve sources prescribed by the instructor, rather than sources students search for and identify themselves. In Seminar II, students build on and continue to develop the academic abilities introduced in Seminar I. The seminar culminates in independent student projects that incorporate sources beyond the instructor-prescribed course materials.

Guidelines:

1. These seminars teach students how to frame a problem or question, how to develop a thesis, how to defend their thesis effectively, and how to think critically about arguments—their own and those of others.
2. These seminars address important conventions of written argumentation (including audience, organization, and style), as well as approaching writing as a process.
 - a. In Seminar I, assignments focus on material largely provided by the instructor.
 - b. In Seminar II, students produce a substantive scholarly paper or project that involves independent research.
3. Each seminar requires students to present arguments orally through discussion and more structured presentation.
4. Concepts and practices of information literacy including issues of academic integrity are integrated into the seminar.
 - a. Seminar I: Students learn to distinguish between different types of information sources (for example, scholarly vs. popular, primary vs. secondary) and learn to evaluate sources of information for biases, reliability, and appropriateness.
 - b. Seminar II: Students learn to craft research questions, search for and retrieve information, and seek appropriate assistance in the research process.