

University of Puget Sound
Faculty Meeting Minutes
December 8, 2008

1. Call to Order

Dean Kristine Bartanen called the meeting to order at 4 p.m. in the WSC Rotunda. Forty members of the faculty were present by 4:30 p.m.

2. Faculty Secretary

Professor Rob Hutchinson nominated Professor Gwynne Brown to be Secretary of the Faculty. This was seconded and approved by wild acclamation.

3. Approval of minutes

The minutes for the October 28 meeting were not approved, as they had not yet been distributed.

4. Report of the Academic Vice-President

Dean Bartanen reported that Professor Jim Evans was named Washington state's Professor of the Year by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and the Council for Advancement and Support of Education.

5. Report of the Chair of the Faculty Senate

Faculty Senate Chair Doug Cannon reported that following the presentation by Rosa Beth Gibson on faculty benefits at the last Faculty Senate Meeting, the Senate passed a motion to appoint an ad hoc committee to discuss benefits further. Anyone interested in serving on this committee should speak to Cannon, Professor Terry Beck, or Professor Suzanne Holland. This committee may be coordinating with the Human Resources Department.

6. Faculty Survey on Course Evaluation Forms

Professor Suzanne Holland called attention to a handout ("Evaluation Form Report," attached) summarizing the results of the faculty survey on course evaluations. There were lots of respondents and narrative comments. An ad hoc committee led by Professor Robin Foster last spring analyzed the responses, and is working on revising the course evaluation forms in light of faculty comments. Input and suggestions are welcome.

Associate Dean Sarah Moore said that drafts of revised forms are being passed around now, will come to the Senate and then be put before the Faculty.

Holland said that changes will be recommended concerning both what's on the form and how forms are used.

Moore was asked about the possibility of doing course evaluations electronically. She answered that students take them more seriously when they do the evaluations during class, with a standardized prefatory statement and length of time. Hutchinson added that students are less apt to do evaluations electronically, even if doing so is required for them to get their grade.

Holland noted that the "number crunching" aspect of course evaluations was not popular on the faculty survey, but she is starting to think it's a good idea anyway.

7. Proposed Revision to Core Curriculum Guidelines for First-Year Seminars

Professor Mary Rose Lamb reported that the 2007-2008 Curriculum Committee recommended revising the rubrics for first-year seminars to include addressing academic honesty. Drafts were distributed to the attendees (“First-Year Seminar Guidelines Revision,” attached). Lamb noted that one advantage of this inclusion would be that students could not claim ignorance when confronted about plagiarism, etc.

Linda Williams M/S/outcome reported below: To adopt revisions to the guidelines for the Seminar in Writing and Rhetoric and for the seminar in Scholarly and Creative Inquiry as recommended by the 2007-2008 Curriculum Committee.

Professor Priti Joshi, having been appointed to speak on behalf of the English department, said that in general this seems like a good idea, but it is important to underscore that teaching about academic honesty is *every* faculty member’s responsibility, not just those who teach the first-year seminars (a large number of whom are in the English department). Professor Keith Ward added that an addition of academic honesty to the first-year seminar curriculum should not be seen as an inoculation against future plagiarism by students. Lamb agreed that seminar teachers, especially junior faculty, should not be made to feel responsible for students’ future actions.

Further discussion ensued. Questions that were raised included: should *all* the core rubrics mention academic honesty as a component (Joshi)? Could the academic honesty component of a course be satisfied by an extra page in the course syllabus (Eric Orlin)? Don’t first-year seminars already deal with academic honesty (Ariela Tubert)? Shouldn’t we have a director of first-year seminars to help ensure better outcomes across the board (Holland)? Shouldn’t this be part of a more holistic program promoting academic honesty (Lisa Ferrari)?

Orlin M/S/P to postpone indefinitely until the Academic Standards Committee can consider the issue more holistically.

8. Faculty Evaluation Process

Professor Cannon noted that the Faculty Advancement Committee is short of willing nominees because of its burdensome and time-intensive responsibilities. This problem was discussed in the Faculty Senate and it was suggested that committee members should receive two release units per year instead of one. Cannon wonders, however, whether it is possible that the huge amount of time and energy expended by the committee members is not in fact well spent.

Cannon provided a brief history of the evaluation system since the early 1970s, the point at which the University revised its prior strategy emphasizing growth and the Trustees and President began to put much greater emphasis on faculty excellence in teaching at all levels and in scholarship. Vague faculty evaluation policy procedures became much more clearly defined with the adoption of the first Faculty Code. In the years since, there have been a number of piecemeal changes to the Code as pertaining to the evaluation process, but never a thorough rethinking of the process as a whole.

On the plus side, the evaluation process continues to be an effective tool for the aims of the 1970s; teaching at Puget Sound is excellent, and we are recognized and competitive nationally in terms of scholarship and research. The issues of who gets evaluated when, how departments and the FAC contribute, and how resources are expended are all well delineated.

Issues that have been proposed in recent years and remain open for consideration include: (1) early tenure; (2) how the students' course evaluation forms are used; (3) uniformity in evidence of professional growth; (4) the evaluation of people in composite appointments; (5) further resources for faculty being evaluated for tenure, especially in "troubled" departments—should there be an ombudsman or members of the FAC to act as a consulting resource?; (6) not evaluating faculty for promotion before evaluating them for tenure; (7) strengthening the standards for full professorship; (8) the use of external review, at tenure or at promotion; (9) the potential risks for junior faculty in writing letters for colleagues' open files.

Discussion followed Cannon's presentation, particularly on the problems inherent in open tenure files, the merits and demerits of using outside reviews, the usefulness (or lack thereof) of three-year Associate reviews, and the stringency of full professorship requirements. Contributors to the discussion included Professors David Lupher, Holland, Orlin, Barbara Warren, Joshi, Ward, Rose, Kristin Johnson, Seth Weinberger, Cannon, Linda Williams, and Brendan Lanctot, and Dean Bartanen.

Dean Bartanen said that for a major overhaul of the evaluation procedures, an ad hoc committee would need to form and submit a proposal to the Faculty.

9. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Gwynne Brown
Secretary of the Faculty

Date: May 1, 2008
To: Faculty Senate
From: Mary Rose Lamb

2007-8 Curriculum Committee Final Report

This report summarizes the work undertaken by the Curriculum Committee during the 2007-8 academic year.

.....

III. Addition of Consideration of Academic Honesty in the First Year Seminars

The Faculty Senate and Academic Standards Committee charged the Curriculum Committee to “consider adding discussion of academic honesty and integrity to first year seminars.” We began with a discussion as a committee of the whole. In our deliberation we considered the need for such discussions and the best place for those discussions. We saw that writing courses were a good place to incorporate honesty issues into assignments. We considered the possible negative impact on student evaluations of young faculty if students saw discussions of academic integrity as being “policed” by the professor. We talked about the “growing culture of academic dishonesty” on campus and the need for an honor code. Finally, we asked the working group that reviewed proposals for the First Year Seminars to take on the task of crafting language to be added to the seminar rubrics and guidelines. The guidelines were accepted by the Curriculum Committee on 4/18/08 and are appended to the report (Appendix A). We trust that the Senate will bring this discussion to the full faculty next fall.

.....

Appendix A.

Seminar in Writing and Rhetoric Rubric

Learning Objectives

In each Seminar in Writing and Rhetoric, students encounter the two central aspects of the humanistic tradition of rhetorical education: argumentation and effective oral and written expression. Students in these seminars develop the intellectual habits and language capabilities to construct persuasive arguments and to write and speak effectively, **and with integrity**, for academic and civic purposes.

Guidelines

- I. Through their introduction to argumentation, these seminars address:
 - A. the value of pro/con reasoning and the need to approach a controversy from multiple perspectives;
 - B. issues and questions that organize a particular controversy;
 - C. standard argument forms and other persuasive strategies (for example, traditional and contemporary models of reasoning, narrative); and
 - D. methods of evaluating arguments (including evidence evaluation and identification of logical fallacies).
- II. Through their introduction to effective expression, these seminars address:
 - A. important elements and conventions of standard written English;
 - B. the range of lexical and stylistic resources available to speakers and writers (for example, appropriateness, audience, tone, voice, and other aspects of a message's verbal texture); and
 - C. various oral and written composition strategies, including approaching composition as a process (including purposeful drafting, revising, and editing).
- III. These seminars address respect for the intellectual work and ideas of others by acknowledging the use of information sources in communicating one's own work. Methods for addressing academic integrity are built in to seminar assignments.**
- IV. These seminars may be organized around topics, themes, or texts; in each seminar the material must be appropriate and accessible for meaningful work by first-year students.

Scholarly and Creative Inquiry Rubric

Learning Objectives

The purpose of this core area is to introduce students to the processes of scholarly and creative inquiry through direct participation in that inquiry. Students in a Scholarly and Creative Inquiry Seminar gain a degree of mastery that comes with deep exposure to a focused seminar topic. They increase their ability to frame and explore questions, to support claims, and to respond to others' questions and differing opinions. Finally, students develop and demonstrate their intellectual independence by engaging in substantive written work on the topic in papers or projects, **employing good practices of academic integrity.**

Guidelines

- I. Scholarly and Creative Inquiry seminars examine a focused scholarly topic, set of questions, or theme.
- II. Since seminars in this category are taken in the student's freshman year, they are designed to be accessible and appropriate for the accomplishment of meaningful work by students without previous preparation in the course's field. This requirement informs the choice of topic or theme of the course, the choice of texts or materials to be treated in the course, and the design of assignments for the course.
- III. Seminars in Scholarly and Creative Inquiry require substantive written work on the topic in papers or projects and include significant intellectual exchange both between the instructor and the students and among the students. Careful, sustained, and recurrent examination of ideas and sources (broadly defined to include data, texts, media, and/or other visual, aural, or graphic material) play a central role in the course. Pedagogical methods take advantage of the opportunities provided by a seminar setting.
- IV. **Seminars in Scholarly and Creative Inquiry address respect for the intellectual work and ideas of others by acknowledging the use of information sources in communicating one's own work. Methods for addressing academic integrity are built in to seminar assignments.**