Faculty Senate Meeting
Monday, May 5th, 2008

Senators in attendance: Kris Bartanen, Terry Beck, Nancy Bristow, Douglas Cannon
(Chair), Robin Foster, John Hanson, Rob Hutchinson, Jim McCullough, Leslie Saucedo,
Mike Segawa, Ross Singleton.

Visitors: Roger Allen, David Balaam, Alyce DeMarais, Peter Greenfield, Mary Rose
Lamb, Nick Kontogeorgopoulos, Mark Reinitz, Mike Spivey, George Tomlin, Mike
Valentine, Nila Wiese

Meeting called to order at 4:02 p.m. by Chair Cannon.

Cannon introduced the visitors present at the time and indicated that as representatives of
the standing committees present their year-end reports, they should alert the Senate of
any item that they would like the Senate to act on this spring (this point was restated
throughout the meeting as new visitors arrived).

I. Approval of Minutes of April 21, 2008
The minutes of the April 21, 2008 meeting were approved, with two minor corrections
that were amended by Jim McCullough.

II. Announcements:
Cannon reported on behalf of John Hanson that faculty election results are complete with
the exception of voting for four new Faculty Senators (which will end May 7th). The
results will be passed on to Dean Bartanen.

Cannon next announced (on his own behalf) that his report to the Board of Trustees will
be included as an attachment to today's minutes.

Upon arriving later, John Hansen also announced that the ad hoc committee on elections
would present a report next fall.

III. Special Orders
Cannon spoke on behalf of Yvonne Swinth that she would like the Senate to have a
discussion regarding the possibility of on-campus daycare.

IV. Reports of Committee Liaisons
None!

V. Two Faculty Code Interpretations
The Senate received documents (included as attachments) from the PSC containing
two new interpretations of the Faculty Code: The one inteprets the term "spouse" and the
term "mate" to mean spouse or domestic partner.   The other revives an interpretation
made in 1998 but inadvertently deleted from a subsequent reprinting of the Code. It
concerns whether a 5-year evaluation of a full professor entails "altering the status of the

evaluated member's appointment," and is thus eligible for appeal. It concludes that a regular 5-year evaluation does *not* alter that status (unless it could result in dismissal).

VI. Year-end Reports from Standing Committees

Academic Standards Report

Mike Spivey presented the report. He pointed out that the number of petitions had decreased but that the number of hearings had increased. Much of the year's work had been devoted to academic honesty issues and efforts had begun to update the student handbook, add online resources and establish an honor code.

Saucedo noted that eligibility requirements to receive University honors had been updated to allow students with more than 4 units of AP credit to be eligible. This standard had not been applied retroactively and she asked why this was the case.

Spivey replied that they had pursued applying the revision towards Spring 2007 graduates, but that the student for whom the concern was raised had actually graduated in Fall 2006.

Bartanen asked about the appropriateness of the committee size.

Spivey replied that it may be bigger than necessary.

Beck asked how far along the committee was on addressing academic honesty issues.

Spivey noted that the integrity statement was revised but that work on an honor code and online resources was just beginning.

The report of the Academic Standards Committee was formally received by the Senate.

Curriculum Committee Report

Mary Rose Lamb presented the report.

Cannon first asked whether attachments were standard for year-end reports from the Curriculum Committee, noting that they were helpful.

Lamb indicated that yes, they were.

Lamb said that there were no items in need of immediate attention from the Senate but pointed out that as recommended by the Senate, language directed towards academic honesty had been added to the rubric of first year seminars. Lamb also highlighted that a clear set of standards had been designed to fit different types of internship opportunities to merit academic credit. Lamb next reported that discussions of Connections Core are a source of tension; primarily because of the difficulty in measuring interdisciplinarity

makes this core more fluid than others. She indicated that the Curriculum Committee had extensively discussed and decided against developing a set of standards. She expected that this will be a continuing issue as the committee considers the core as a whole next year.

Bristow asked a question as to how the "Livingston Rule" (that final grades be due by noon on the first Monday two weeks after the end of the final exam period or January 2, whichever is later) will be applied.

Lamb noted that the Registrar is a member of the committee.

DeMarais added that we could include it in calendar setting guidelines.

The report of the Curriculum Committee was formally received by the Senate.

Faculty Advancement Committee Report

Peter Greenfield presented the report and brought two matters to the attention of the Senate. First, many evaluations had been submitted late, making the spring semester particularly busy. Second, since the option of open files for tenure evaluation, junior faculty seem more reluctant when contributing to senior faculty evaluations.

Singleton noted that the Senate never dealt with the open file revision; that it had gone straight to the faculty. He made the recommendation that the Senate take up this issue next semester and include other standing committees in the conversation.

Foster asked what percent of those eligible elected to have streamline reviews.

Greenfield indicted that nearly everyone who could, did chose the streamline option.

Hutchinson asked for clarification on whether the new policy regarding open files was specifically for tenure cases.

Cannon asked if the comparison of junior faculty involvement was relative to previous years.

Bartanen pointed out that because the vote did occur, the issue was salient.

Cannon acknowledged that Singleton wants the Senate to reconsider open files for tenure.

Hutchinson asked whether we should take up the concern of the workload of the FAC, given that this year only 4 faculty members agreed to join the committee.

Foster suggested increasing the number of committee members to dilute the workload.

Hutchinson suggested 1 year appointments with 2 release units.

Greenfield pointed out that a 1 year appointment wouldn't allow for much progress along the learning curve and that increasing the committee size would only work if the increase was enough to allow formation of subcommittees.

Foster said that was the idea.

Greenfield estimated that it would require 2-3 times the current number of members.

Bristow supported Hutchinson's idea for the Senate to take up the concern of the workload of FAC members.

Singleton asked whether the number of delayed files was unusual this year.

Greenfield said yes and added that while the decisions made in the fall are often harder, the number of files to assess in the spring is greater and thus the spring is when the one unit release is most needed.

Foster conveyed to Greenfield that the Senate had directed concerns about disparities across department evaluations to the PSC, which had sent it back to the Senate. She asked if there were any explicit examples of disparity documented.

Greenfield responded that the FAC does not want rigid guidelines but thinks there are disparities across departmental guidelines that the PSC had approved.

Cannon noted that necessity of confidentiality makes it difficult for the Senate to get clear direction from the FAC.

Greenfield suggested that departments would benefit from seeing what defines professional growth across departments.

Cannon wondered if former FAC members would be willing to speak to the Senate.

Greenfield thought yes, excluding himself.

Hutchinson asked if the code was too open-ended and whether that is the source of the disparity.

Bartanen stated that the faculty code indicates "excellence in professional growth" and that departments write the guidelines for meeting the code. Departments feels differently as to what meets criteria. She hopes the faculty will have a conversation about this matter.

The report of the Faculty Advancement Committee was formally received by the Senate.

University Enrichment Committee Report

Mark Reinitz presented the report. While noting that nothing requires immediate attention of the Senate he wanted to call attention to the fact that the amount of money requested each year increases and so far has been approved by the BTF. However, while in past years the UEC could partially fund 2nd requests for conference travel, this year 1st trips were barely covered.

Bristow asked about the wording relating to funding travel for professional duties. She asked whether members of an editorial board would be eligible for funding.

Reinitz said they would be considered on a case by case basis.

Reinitz added that it would be possible for the UEC to downsize to 12 committee members but this would require strong attendance by all members.

Beck inquired into the procedure by which the UEC could get more money.

Reinitz responded that areas of greatest need were identified and then the Associate Dean submits request to BTF.

Bartanen clarified that the requests are received by the academic Associate Dean and presented as part of the academic division's request to the budget force.

The report of the Curriculum Committee was formally received by the Senate.

Professional Standards Committee Report

George Tomlin presented the report, noting that the committee had only evaluated one departmental guideline for faculty evaluations. In the next year, the committee planned to make code amendments to address awkward or contradictory language.

Bristow asked what recommendations the PSC had for the Senate.

Tomlin replied that having a vice-chair or chair-elect would be helpful as would having members-in-waiting. Both would be important resources when grievances are being resolved, which ties up the whole committee.

Bristow asked if the bylaws needed to be changed and if so, should the Senate initiate a move.

Foster pointed out that the Senate had previously discussed the idea of members-in-waiting.

Cannon cited a motion from the minutes of the February 25th Senate meeting that called on the PSC to reconsider structure and composition of the committee, during next academic year.

Hutchinson asked if other committees could be paired with the PSC for resolving grievances, such as the honor court.

Cannon asked Tomlin if he wanted any immediate action by the Senate.

Tomlin said no.

The report of the Professional Standards Committee was formally received by the Senate.

Cannon complimented Tomlin on the efficiency of the PSC, for managing to address a very long list of charges.

Student Life Committee Report

Nick Kontogeorgopoulos presented the report and explained that the submitted report was so comprehensive because of the big turnover in membership anticipated in the fall. He wanted the document to serve to orient new members.

Beck asked whether the 14 charges that committee had recommended for next year were doable.

Kontogeorgopoulos said that they were specific needs that specifically tackle what is intended by the more usual open-ended charges. He felt they could be accomplished.

Kontogeorgopoulos indicated that he was very pleased with the current, 85% response rate from the study abroad survey. He is hopeful that is will be useful data for the International Education Committee.

The report of the Student Life Committee was formally received by the Senate.

Cannon thanked Kontogeorgopoulos for moving the committee along so nicely and asked if there was anything that the Senate needed to act on this spring.

Kontogeorgopoulos said no.

Segawa noted the outstanding work that Chair K. has given this academic year.

Library, Media and Information Services Committee Report

Bill Dasher presented the report. He began by announcing that the committee had its final meeting two weeks earlier and asked if the Senate had any new work for LMIS.

Foster asked if the committee had drafted any charges to be considered by the Senate.

Dasher indicated that there are 3 ongoing charges and all are works in progress.

Hutchinson asked for clarification regarding back-up computers for faculty.

Dasher noted that Theresa Duhart will create and post a document with instructions.

Cannon asked for more details regarding intellectual property.

Dasher responded that last year some material was being considered by a subcommittee but that the discussion has gone slowly on account of waiting for a new library director.

Cannon clarified that the working description of intellectual property in the LMIS committee report is not yet policy.

DeMarais noted that while the policy for use of copyrighted materials is well-established, intellectual property discussions have revealed many complexities.

Bartanen pointed out that LMIS drafted a copyright policy and it has been sent to the legal department.

Cannon asked if the Senate needed to act on anything this spring.

Dasher replied no.

The report of the Library, Media, and Information Services Committee was formally received by the Senate.

Beck inquired as to how next year's committee will be made aware of the ongoing charges and pointed out that typical protocol is for the committee to suggest charges in the year-end report.

Dasher said committee had other avenues to pursue, such as new technology. He would like to entertain ideas of new technology by allowing the faculty to bring ideas forward. He expects the ideas to be fleshed out by the new CTO and Library Director and that the ideas can be presented to the Senate in the future.

DeMarais noted that additional ongoing committee charges are available in other documents.

Cannon requested that DeMarais forward those charges to the Senate.

Diversity Committee Report

Mike Valentine and Nila Wiese presented the report.

Valentine acknowledged that the Senate had been highly involved in diversity matters this year.

Wiese announced that the Staff Senate is currently looking over the newly drafted bylaws.

Hutchinson noted that the committee had previously felt that they lacked "teeth."

Wiese responded that the new bylaws they have proposed gave the committee more active roles than previously; that the committee would now be able to do more than simply support other committees.

Cannon wondered why there wasn't more visibility of the committee's role in the curriculum.

Wiese stated that the proposed bylaws allowed for creating liaisons to serve this purpose.

Valentine said the committee's role is to assess rather than to promote specific curriculum but that the intention is there.

The report of the Diversity Committee was formally received by the Senate.

Bristow thanked the committee for their hard work.

Foster acknowledged that the committee had kept up with diversity issues all across campus.

Cannon noted the committee's previous frustration in last year's report and asked if the committee wanted more on behalf of the Senate.

Wiese indicated that the new structure will help the faculty focus and give the staff a stronger voice.

Cannon asked if current report is comprehensive enough for the Senate to meet the needs of the committee and whether the Senate has dropped the ball.

Wiese said that she is unsure as to what is expected in terms of a response to the report on acceptance/retention of underrepresented students.

Valentine said he is unsure how the Faculty Senate will use curriculum assessments provided by Diversity Committee.

Institutional Review Board Report

Roger Allen presented the Institutional Review Board's report. He began by noting that the IRB serves the purpose of protecting human subjects, protecting researchers using human subjects and protecting the university. The IRB considered 175 research

protocols. Of that number, 158 were eligible for expedited review at the department level or were determined to be exempt. The remaining 17 received full board review.

Foster asked if the IRB intended to submit a report on the process of obtaining federal-wide assurance.

Allen responded affirmatively.

Chair Cannon inquired as to the status of the "Mission Creep" issue raised earlier by Senator Suzanne Holland.

Allen responded that the review process is required for more than just federally mandated reasons as the "Mission Creep" document contends. Allen noted that the IRB intends to serve the faculty by providing necessary information.

Foster asked the IRB to notify Department Chairs/School Directors as to the appropriate requirements associated with outside researchers soliciting student subjects for research projects.

The following motion was passed.

The University of Puget Sound Faculty Senate thanks Marsha Gallacher, in her service as a community representative on the University's Institutional Review Board for her contributions to protecting the safety of research participants and for enhancing the quality and scope of the exchange of ideas regarding human research on this campus.

Chair Cannon will write a letter to Marsha Gallacher notifying her of the Senate's action.

The report of the IRB was formally received by the Senate.

Interim Study Abroad Committee Report

David Balaam presented the year end report of the Interim Study Abroad Committee.

Singleton inquired as to the nature of the discussion surrounding the decision of ISAC to endorse the proposal of the Study Abroad Working Group (SAWG) to alter the structure of the study abroad program by making all programs Partner program.

Balaam reported that all the implications of this proposed change are not completely clear to ISAC members but the proposal appears a good first step toward addressing the financial concerns around study abroad.

DeMarais reported that the 2006-2007 ISAC recommended that all study abroad programs be designated as partner programs (prior to the SAWG recommendation).

Bartanen noted that no final decision regarding this proposal has been made.

Balaam noted that in the process of reviewing study abroad programs the committee determined that new programs (probably SIT programs) in Africa and the Middle East should be added to our roster.

Walter Lowrie Sustained Service Award

In closed session the Senate selected a faculty member to be awarded Lowrie Award at the Fall Faculty dinner.

Closing Comments

Senate members expressed deep appreciation for the effective and efficient manner in which Chair Doug Cannon has conducted Senate business this year.

The Senate adjourned at 6:12pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Leslie Saucedo

The "Lost" Interpretation, PSC, Spring 2008

The interpretation has to do with a "lost" interpretation that had been issued in 1998 and was inadvertently deleted from a subsequent reprinting of the Code. In the meantime many of the references in the original interpretation have become outdated. Thus the PSC decided to issue a restatement of the now "found" and "updated" interpretation of 1998.

The PSC voted to issue this Code interpretation on April 18, 2008.

Here is what the 1998 Code says in the passage in question (it describes situations in which the President does not have to take action in evaluations).

Section 6 - Evaluation and Decision by the President

a.   If the evaluation was not made for the purpose of altering the status of the evaluated faculty member's appointment, no presidential action shall be called for. In that event, the President shall take note of the evaluation report and accompanying information and shall return the same to the dean, to be included in the faculty member's file.

- In 1998 (we presume) the PSC interpreted that passage as follows:

Interpretation of Chapter III, Section 6, Whether a Five-Year Evaluation of a Full Professor Entails "Altering the Status of the Evaluated Faculty Member's Appointment" So As To Be Subject to Appeals Procedures:

      In Chapter III, Section 6, Paragraph a, of the Faculty Code, "altering the status of the evaluated faculty member's appointment" refers to the following cases: reappointment of an untenured faculty member (Chapter II, Part A, Section 5); promotion (Chapter II, Part B); tenure (Chapter IV); or dismissal (Chapter V, Part A). The five year evaluations of tenured full professors do not involve reappointment, tenure or promotion. Hence the appeals procedures specified in Chapter III, Sections 6, 7, and 8, are not applicable. The only instance in which an evaluation of a tenured full professor entails "altering the status of the evaluated faculty member's appointment" is an evaluation in which the Faculty Advancement Committee makes a "negative" recommendation (Chapter III, Section 5, Paragraph e) and the faculty member receives an "unsatisfactory evaluation" (Chapter V, Part A, Section E, Paragraph a), in which case the Code's provisions for dismissal of a tenured faculty member may be invoked (Chapter IV, Section 7, Paragraph a; and Chapter V, Part A, Section 1, Section 2, Paragraph a, and Section 3, Paragraph a). In that instance, an appeals procedure is provided by Chapter V, Part A, Sections 3 and 4.

- That same passage that was interpreted in 1998 appears exclusively on page 16 of the 2007 code, in Chapter III, Section 4, d (2).

- The reasoning behind that interpretation would still appear to be valid. However, the interpretation makes numerous references to Code sections that are now in different locations, as follows:

1998 interpretation reference	Corresponding location in 2007 code
In Chapter III, Section 6, Paragraph a, of the Faculty Code, "altering the status of the evaluated faculty member's appointment"	Chapter III, Section 4, d (2).
reappointment of an untenured faculty member (Chapter II, Part A, Section 5)	Chapter II, Section 5
promotion (Chapter II, Part B)	Chapter 4, Section 2
tenure (Chapter IV)	Chapter 4, Section I
dismissal (Chapter V, Part A)	Unchanged
appeals procedures specified in Chapter III, Sections 6, 7, and 8	Chapter III, Sections 6 and 7 (what about recent changes to code?)
a "negative" recommendation (Chapter III, Section 5, Paragraph e)	Chapter III, Section 4, c, subsection 5 (b)
"unsatisfactory evaluation" (Chapter V, Part A, Section E, Paragraph a), [**note: probably this should have been Chapter V, Part A, section 3, a]** Chapter IV, Section 7, Paragraph a and Chapter V, Part A, Section 1, Section 2, Paragraph a, and Section 3, Paragraph a).	Chapter V, Section 3, a (2) Does not exist anymore. Dismissal only in Chapter V (see ref. below) Unchanged Unchanged
appeals procedure is provided by Chapter V, Part A, Sections 3 and 4	Chapter V, Part A, Sections 3 and 4

- What we need to do-

  1. Insert the missing Code interpretation in its appropriate place (page 44 of the current Code), and

  2. Assuming that this interpretation was sent to the Senate and approved by the Trustees in 1998, and since we have evidently determined (for now) that we can't amend existing interpretations, we need to issue a new interpretation:

Interpretation of the 1998 Interpretation of Chapter III, Section 6, Whether a Five-Year Evaluation of a Full Professor Entails "Altering the Status of the Evaluated Faculty Member's Appointment" So As To Be Subject to Appeals Procedures. In order to reflect changes in the Code since the adoption of the 1998 interpretation, the original interpretation shall be reinterpreted to read as follows:

In Chapter III, Section 4, d(2) , of the Faculty Code, "altering the status of the evaluated faculty member's appointment" refers to the following cases: reappointment of an untenured faculty member (Chapter II, Section 5); promotion (Chapter IV, Section II); tenure (Chapter IV, Section 1); or dismissal (Chapter V, Part A). The five year evaluations of tenured full professors do not involve reappointment, tenure or promotion. Hence the appeals procedures specified in Chapter III, Sections 6, 7, and 8, are not applicable. The only instance in which an evaluation of a tenured full professor entails "altering the status of the evaluated faculty member's appointment" is an evaluation in which the Faculty Advancement Committee makes a "negative" recommendation (Chapter III, Section 4, Paragraph c, 5,b) and the faculty member receives an "unsatisfactory evaluation" (Chapter V, Part A, Section 3, a (2), in which case the Code's provisions for dismissal of a tenured faculty member may be invoked (Chapter V, Part A, Section 1, Section 2, Paragraph a, and Section 3, Paragraph a). In that instance, an appeals procedure is provided by Chapter V, Part A, Section 4.

George Tomlin, Chair
Professional Standards Committee

The "Lost" Interpretation, PSC, Spring 2008

The PSC has recently agreed upon two Code interpretations I'd like to ask you to convey to the Faculty Senate.

Interpretation of Terms for Spouse and Domestic Partner

The interpretation has to do with the use of the terms "spouse" and "mate" in the Faculty Code. In the two places where these terms appear, it is the PSC's interpretation (voted on April 4, 2008; wording confirmed April 18, 2008) that the intent is such as to cover "domestic partner" relationships as well. Thus, the PSC has issued the following Code interpretation, to be placed in the Code Appendix immediately after the existing interpretation of "working days." Namely,

"To be added to the Appendix at line 1 on page 39

Interpretation of "spouse" and "mate" in Faculty Code Interpretations (citations provided below):

In order to clarify provisions of the Code, inclusive of Code interpretations, the term "spouse" and the term "mate" mean spouse or domestic partner.
This interpretation applies to the term "spouse" and the term "mate" as they appear in these and any other places in the Code:

Interpretation of Chapter I, Part C., Section 2, and Chapter I, Part D, Section 4. Spouses/Children Taking Courses from Faculty (PS made voluntary 26 September 1986; accepted by Faculty Senate 3 November 1986)

Interpretation of Chapter III, Section 4. Department Discussion of Candidate's Evaluation Being Attended by Candidate or Candidate's Spouse who is also a Member of the Department (PSC Minutes 16 October 1989)"

The PSC voted to issue this Code interpretation on April 18, 2008.

Thanks,

George

Report of the Chair of the Faculty Senate

to the

Board of Trustees of the University of Puget Sound

April 25, 2008

As the academic year draws to a close some matters that have occupied the faculty Senate and the faculty generally have been settled and others have been brought into better focus for continued discussion and action in the fall. Reflecting the former are the following decisions that the faculty as a whole have ratified. They will require Board confirmation before they take effect.

(1) Amending several sections of the Faculty Code to disentangle the regular process of faculty evaluation from the adjudication of lapses in professional ethics. The latter are properly handled through the grievance process. In effect the changes suspend the evaluation process when a charge of professional dereliction arises, whether on the part of a faculty member being evaluated or of a faculty member who is evaluating. Not until the grievance process is concluded will the evaluation go forward.

(2) Amending the Faculty By-Laws to incorporate the interim committee on study abroad as a standing International Education Committee.

A better understanding has been reached between faculty and administration on class scheduling, and the prospect has arisen of a deeper revision of the scheduling framework, one that will combine fuller use of classroom space with more options for courses, especially in the humanities, that meet in the seminar style.

Continuing faculty discussion falls especially in two general areas— faculty evaluation and faculty role in achieving diversity objectives. In both cases steps have been taken and provisional decisions made. The effect in both areas has been to heighten faculty awareness, to highlight issues for consideration, and to lay the ground for full faculty discussion next academic year.

In the area of faculty evaluation, the Board has already ratified a fine-tuning of the procedure for periodic streamlining. The Senate has asked the Professional Standards Committee to craft Code language permitting faculty to

be considered for tenure earlier than the usual sixth year in service without raising the standards that apply in the usual case. We also conducted a survey of the faculty on the effectiveness of the Instructor Evaluation Form. A remarkable sixty-one percent of faculty responded, showing general satisfaction with the form but indicating several respects in which the form might be improved. Greater unease was expressed concerning the use of the form, ways in which different readers might draw different conclusions and misunderstandings about expectations. Some misgivings have surfaced independently about how our several departments and schools evaluate professional growth, in particular about disparities regarding evidence. These concerns together constitute a widespread reflection on our system of faculty evaluation and the substantial energies that we devote to it. The Senate expects to formalize that reflection with both focus groups and full faculty fora on the various issues.

Coincident with the appointment of a Chief Diversity Officer and development of a campus-wide Diversity Strategic Plan, the Senate also has been engaged in this area. It has charged the faculty Diversity Committee to recommend a reorganization that would better focus faculty energies, and has referred to them its endorsement of including diversity issues as a permanent element of on-campus faculty development and of re-examining the University Diversity Statement, perhaps to strengthen it and to specify what we mean by diversity more clearly. I expect further Senate and faculty discussion of initiatives particularly in the areas of "increasing the number of faculty . . from underrepresented faculty groups," of improving "the quality of experiences" for such students and faculty, and of "continued development of curriculum and scholarship addressing issues of social diversity, pedagogy, and multiculturalism." The Faculty Senate is acutely aware that these parts of the Diversity Strategic Plan all fall under the responsibilities of the faculty outlined in the Faculty Code, and is prepared to fulfill these responsibilities.

Sincerely yours,

Douglas F. Cannon
Professor of Philosophy
Chair of the Faculty Senate

Final Report for the 2007-2008 Academic Year
Academic Standards Committee

I. **Ongoing business**

a. **Petitions.** A subcommittee met regularly to hear and decide on student petitions for waivers to academic policies. The subcommittee decided 157 petitions: 132 approved, 24 denied, and 1 no action. This is a decrease of almost 22% from the 201 petitions that were decided last year. As has been the practice recently, the committee authorized the registrar and the petitions preview team to decide on routine petitions; of the 132 approvals, 45 were done by the petition preview team. Given the large size of the full committee and the amount of work required of the petitions subcommittee the committee decided for this year that petitions subcommittee members would not be required to attend meetings of the full committee.

b. **Hearing Boards.** Ten hearing boards have been held during the past year: four for grade disputes and six for academic dishonesty. Two of the latter were second hearing boards concerning the same individuals. One of the grade disputes resulted in changing the grade from F to P – the first time a hearing board has changed a grade in over a decade. As there were only two hearing boards in each of the past two academic years the ten this year represent a huge increase in the number of hearing boards.

II. **Old business**

a. **Revision of academic honesty policy.** Last year the committee began work on updating the academic honesty policy to reflect issues that can arise with the internet. During the course of this discussion the committee came to the belief that academic honesty on campus needs to be addressed in a much more active way than it currently is. In addition to updating the academic honesty policy in the print version of the academic handbook (see attached document), the committee 1) passed a resolution recommending that the Senate charge the curriculum committee with requiring all first-year seminars in both fall and spring terms to include a discussion of academic honesty, 2) began work on creating an honor code for the university, and 3) formed a subcommittee to look into supplementing the academic honesty policy in the handbook with online material (such as additional examples and an academic honesty quiz like those found at some other institutions).

b. **Review of withdrawal grade policy.** The committee affirmed the withdrawal grade policy implemented at the beginning of the 2006-2007 academic year (an extension of the automatic W period through the sixth week of classes, stronger requirements for a faculty member to assign a W during the seventh through twelfth weeks, a new deadline of the twelfth week beyond which a faculty member cannot assign a W, and granting authority to the academic standards committee to assign W grades after week twelve). Representatives from academic advising and student affairs indicated that the new policy forces more student accountability, which leads to benefits such as the following: earlier attention from academic advising, more incentive to perservere in a course, fewer students withdrawing from courses and thus losing money by having paid for those courses. The registrar also provided data showing that while the number of WF grades has increased with the new policy the overall semester grade-point average has not been affected, and the number of W and WF grades together has declined. The committee also affirmed WF as a grade. The committee believes that WF provides additional information on a transcript beyond that provided by an F, a point attested to in particular by the student members of the committee.

III. **New business**

    a. **Student alert form.** Per a request from the office of academic advising the committee approved an update to the online student alert form to include behavioral issues.

    b. **Substitutions for foreign language requirement.** In recent years the petitions subcommittee has seen a sizable number of requests from students for course substitutions for the foreign language requirement based on learning disabilities. In response to this the committee approved a set of guidelines (see attached) for this situation.

    c. **Graded units and honors.** The committee changed the eligibility requirement for honors at graduation from 28 total graded units and 16 graded units in residence to 16 total graded units. Under the old policy a student with more than four units due to AP credits and activity courses could be ineligible for honors despite having the requisite grade-point average. The new policy is consistent with that at many of our peer institutions in the region. The committee decided not to make this change retroactive.

    d. **Pass/fail grades.** The committee updated language in the graduation requirements section of the academic handbook to clarify that courses used to satisfy the upper-division or foreign language requirements may not be taken pass/fail.

    e. **Withdrawal grades for abandoned courses.** In response to a request from a faculty member the committee affirmed that WF is the appropriate grade for a student who abandons a course and that a compelling reason must be present for another grade to be assigned. The committee began looking at changes to the wording of the withdrawal policy to make this more clear.

IV. **Possible committee charges for next academic year**

    a. **Continue work on creation of an honor code and/or honor pledge**

    b. **Continue work on supplementing the academic honesty policy in the handbook with online material**

    c. **Finalize rewording of withdrawal policy in the situation in which a student abandons a course**

    d. **Committee self-assessment.** This was originally requested of all standing committees during the 2006-2007 academic year, but the academic standards committee has not yet complied.

    e. **Review the policy of requiring students to have drop codes during the automatic W period.** Some petitions arise from students who wish to drop courses but cannot get drop codes from their professors in time. In light of this some committee members began questioning the reason for having drop codes at all during the W period. Perhaps it is worth reviewing this policy.

Respectfully submitted,
Michael Spivey

Attachments

- Revised academic integrity policy

- Guidelines for course substitutions for the foreign language requirement due to a learning disability

Academic Integrity

- Introduction
- Violations of Academic Integrity
- Responses to Violations of Academic Integrity
- Hearing Board Procedures

Introduction

The university is a community of faculty, students, and staff engaged in the exchange of ideas contributing to intellectual growth and development. Essential to the mission of the academic community is a shared commitment to scholarly values, intellectual integrity, and respect for the ideas and work of others. At Puget Sound, we share an assumption of academic integrity at all levels. Violations of academic integrity are a serious matter because they threaten the atmosphere of trust, fairness, and respect essential to learning and the dissemination of knowledge. In situations involving suspected violations of academic integrity, procedures and sanctions established for the Hearing Board (see below) shall be followed. Students are expected to be aware of and abide by the University Academic Integrity Policy. Additionally, faculty members are urged to review course policies regarding academic integrity with their classes.

Violations of Academic Integrity

Violations of academic integrity can take many forms, including but not limited to the following categories:

- Plagiarism, which is appropriating and representing as one's own someone else's words, ideas, research, images, music, video, or computer programs. This includes using papers or parts of papers that are purchased or that are written without compensation for a student by someone else. Copying or using material from public sources without proper citation, including material from the internet, is also plagiarism even if the material appears authorless.
- Misrepresenting one's own work, which includes submitting the same paper or computer program, or parts thereof, for credit in more than one course without the prior permission of the instructors for all of the courses; and misrepresenting of one's attendance in class or at events required of students enrolled in a course (e.g., visiting museums, attending films or concerts, etc.).
- Unauthorized collaboration with other students on course work, which includes working together on projects designed to be independent work; copying another student's work; and seeking or providing inappropriate oral or written assistance that would give the recipient an advantage over other students in an exam or quiz or other course exercise.
- Cheating on examinations, which includes the unauthorized use of notes, books, electronic devices or verbal or non-verbal communication to get or give answers; and giving or receiving help from another person on a take-home exam.
- Violation of honesty in research, which includes falsifying or inventing sources, data, results or evidence; hiding, destroying, or refusing to return sources in order to prevent others from using them; and marking, cutting, or defacing library materials.
- Violation of copyright laws (see the Copy Center's handbook for a summary of copyright guidelines).
- Forgery, falsification, misappropriation, or misrepresentation of information or documents, which includes signatures, documentation of an illness or emergency, and codes used for registration, advising, or identification.
- Misuse of academic computing accounts and facilities.

Deleted:

Deleted: Inappropriate

Deleted: or

Deleted: s

Response to Violations of Academic Integrity

1. If a faculty member has reason to suspect a violation of academic integrity, the following actions are taken:

a. The faculty member may consult with the department chair, program director, or the Registrar regarding his/her suspicion of a violation. The faculty member may also consult with a library liaison for assistance.

b. The faculty member notifies the student that she or he suspects a violation of academic integrity and that an appropriate response will be made.

c. The faculty member meets with the student as a part of the process of determining if a violation of academic integrity has occurred. This meeting may at the faculty member's discretion include the department chair or program director. If the student is not available on campus because the semester has ended or for other reasons, the meeting can happen by phone, mail, or e-mail. If the student is unreachable, then the faculty member determines responsibility based on the available evidence.

d. If the faculty member determines that a violation of academic dishonesty has occurred, he or she is required to submit to the Registrar an Academic Integrity Incident Report (available from the Office of the Registrar), including reasonable documentation of the violation. The report should also indicate penalties the instructor intends to impose and whether or not the instructor recommends further sanctions through the Hearing Board process. The faculty member must provide a copy of the form to the student. The Registrar will then inform the faculty member if this is the student's first offense or not.

e. If there has been no prior reported violation of academic integrity, the penalties imposed by the faculty member conclude the case unless either the student appeals the faculty member's decision or the faculty member asks for a Hearing Board. If either the student or faculty member asks for a Hearing Board, the dean will meet with both parties to seek an appropriate resolution. The dean may also consult with the chair or director of the department or school involved. If no resolution is possible, a Hearing Board will be convened.

2. When step 1d is reached and if a previous violation of academic integrity has been reported to the Office of the Registrar, the following actions are taken:

a. The Registrar notifies the faculty member that at least one previous violation has been reported.

b. The Registrar recommends that a Hearing Board be convened to consider the case and to apply appropriate sanctions (see the next section). All Academic Integrity Incident Reports pertaining to the student are forwarded to the Hearing Board and the faculty member may be consulted by the Board. Depending on the gravity of the offense, the Board may impose any of the sanctions described in Step 4 of the Hearing Board procedures listed below.

3. Academic Integrity Incident Report forms are retained in a confidential file maintained by the Registrar to provide a record of violations of academic integrity for a Hearing Board should a student be the subject of more than one report. Academic Integrity Incident Reports are disposed of following a student's graduation or four years following a student's last enrollment, provided a Hearing Board does not direct otherwise. Contents of the Academic Integrity Incident Report Forms and subsequent Hearing Board actions are revealed only with the written consent of the student,

unless otherwise permitted or required by the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act. No entry is made on the student's permanent academic record of an instance of academic dishonesty, unless so directed by a Hearing Board.

Hearing Board Procedures in Matters of Academic Integrity

The Hearing Board functions as a fact-finding group so that it may determine an appropriate resolution to the charge of a violation of academic integrity. Its hearings are informal, and the parties directly involved are expected to participate. To make knowingly false statements or to otherwise act with malicious intent within the provisions of Hearing Board procedures shall constitute grounds for further charges of violations of academic integrity.

1. If an integrity incident has been referred to the Hearing Board, a Hearing Board is convened to review the case.
2. The Hearing Board consists of the academic dean (chair) and the dean of students or their designees, two faculty members selected by the chair of the Academic Standards Committee, and two students selected by the chair of the Academic Standards Committee in consultation with the president of the Associated Students. The chair designates a secretary, responsible for recording the salient issues before the board and the actions of the board.
3. The parties involved are asked to submit written statements and any written statements submitted are circulated by the chair to the members of the Hearing Board. All parties have the right to appear before the board, and may be asked to appear before the board, but the hearing may proceed regardless of appearance or failure to appear. The parties directly involved may have one other person present who is not an attorney.
4. The board reviews written statements submitted by the parties and any such other relevant material which the chair of the board deems necessary. In hearings involving charges of plagiarism, the Hearing Board may make a judgment that plagiarism has occurred on grounds other than a comparison of the student's work with the original material. Internal stylistic evidence, comparison of the work that is suspect with other written work by the same student, the student's inability to answer questions on what he or she has written, may all support a judgment of plagiarism. When all presentations are complete, the board, in executive session, reaches its resolution of the problem.
5. The Hearing Board may find the allegations not to be factual, or the Hearing Board may impose sanctions. Sanctions include, but are not limited to, warning, reprimand, grade penalty, removal from the course or major, probation, dismissal, suspension, and/or expulsion. The conclusion is presented in writing to the parties directly involved and to such other persons as need to know the results of the hearing. If some action is to be taken, the chair of the board is responsible for requesting that the action be performed and in ensuring that such action is taken. Upon completion of the hearing, the chair maintains a file of relevant material for a period of at least two years.

The decision of the Hearing Board is final.

NOTE: The statement above would constitute the Academic Integrity Policy in full. However, the ASC or CWLT would oversee the creation and maintenance of a website containing additional resources to help students, staff, and faculty better understand the nature of plagiarism and other violations of academic integrity. This material might include the following types of information available through links on the Academic Integrity website:

1. Tips about how to avoid and/or detect plagiarism, such as material adapted with permission from Sydney and Cowen (1980) that is in the existing Academic Dishonesty Statement.

2. A self-test on plagiarism

3. Examples of documents that give concrete definitions and examples of plagiarism within a specific disciplinary context (e.g., within humanities, sciences, social sciences, computer science). Some departments might already have these available.

4. Information about how to correctly use and cite information from the Internet and World Wide Web, currently available at http://library.ups.edu/research/guides/citeurls.htm.

5. Links to anything else related to plagiarism that might be useful (e.g., who to talk to at CWTL or the library to get confidential clarification).

FOREIGN LANGUAGE GRADUATION REQUIREMENT
GUIDELINES FOR COURSE SUBSTITUTIONS DUE TO A LEARNING DISABILITY

If you are considering a petition to the Academic Standards Committee regarding the completion of the Foreign Language Graduation Requirement with courses other than foreign language courses, you should be aware of the requirements and expectations listed below. When the Committee considers your petition, they first determine if you have provided sufficient evidence to establish a learning disability that should be accommodated by allowing substitute courses. The Committee then determines if the courses you are proposing are reasonable substitutes.

Requirements:

1. You are required to provide current documentation from a qualified diagnostic professional of a learning disability which affects your ability to process language. The university's disability coordinator, Ivey West, must also review this documentation.

2. You are also required to meet with Ivey West to make sure that the courses you propose to substitute for the foreign language requirement will not present problems or obstacles similar to, or worse than, the ones you would encounter by taking a foreign language course.

Expectations *:

In order to evaluate the suitability of the student's request for the substitution, the Academic Standards Committee also expects to see discussion of the following points in the petition.

1. You are expected to propose a two-course sequence as substitutes for the 101/102-level foreign language courses.

2. You are expected to complete the proposed sequence over two semesters such that the first course provides some preparation for, or is somehow related to, the second course. Although the content sequence may not be as specific as it is for the progression from a 101 language course to a 102 language course, there is an expectation that you will outline a comparable relationship for the courses you propose.

3. You are expected to justify the courses you have selected as reasonable alternatives to foreign language courses. As you work on your justification keep in mind that, among their other benefits, language courses introduce students to another culture, they introduce students to another way of thinking as expressed in the foreign language, and they provide students with insight to their native language and grammar by contrasting it with a foreign language. Courses which contain some or all of these elements may be appropriate substitutions.

   Please note that there are no specific courses the Committee recommends for students in your situation. Instead, the Committee wants you to argue rationally for the courses you have selected based on your interpretation of the Foreign Language Graduation Requirement and your program of study.

4. If you completed your high school foreign language courses despite your learning disability, you are expected to explain why you are now not able to meet a college-level foreign language requirement.

5. The Committee will not normally grant approval for courses already taken. If a student seeks to meet the foreign language requirement using a course or courses already completed, the committee will expect a particularly strong argument that addresses (a) why the student did not seek approval for the course as meeting the requirement before completing it, and (b) how and why the course should be accepted as satisfying the foreign language requirement.

6. The Committee expects the courses you propose to have no application other than to the Foreign Language Graduation Requirement. That is, your proposed courses may not also fulfill one of your core, major, or minor requirements.

*An "expectation" is not necessarily a requirement. If your petition does not meet each of these expectations, the Committee may still consider your petition provided you convince the Committee that mitigating circumstances excuse you from the expectation in question and the Committee is otherwise convinced of the validity of your proposal.

Approved by ASC 10/31/07

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.

This year we continued the practice introduced by Lisa Wood of having small working groups or subcommittees that stayed together throughout the year to work on a set of issues and reviews. I greatly appreciate the thoughtful consideration of issues by all members of the Committee and their hard work, always completed in a timely fashion. The Committee is also indebted to Bob Matthews for his service as Secretary throughout the year and to Lynda Livingston, who took on the role when Bob had to be absent.

In addition to approving several courses (see On-Going Business of the Committee) the Committee addressed the following issues:

I.   Five Year Reviews

This year the Curriculum Committee accepted the reviews of the departments of Art (2/15/08), Communications Studies (4/25/08), and Classics (2/1/08). In addition, the Committee accepted the five year reviews of the Honors program (2/1/08), International Programs (11/2/07), and the School of Education (4/18/08).

The Curriculum Committee as a whole undertook the review of the Special Interdisciplinary Major (SIM) program (2/15/08). At the present time, we have at most one student per year seeking to create a SIM. The proposed majors are approved by the Curriculum Committee and any changes to the major must be approved by the Committee. Because of the increased availability and flexibility of Interdisciplinary Emphasis programs and minors, some members of the committee wondered if the SIM program was still necessary. Students choosing a SIM have encountered unexpected problems that would be less likely in an established major, for instance, a department failing to offer a course required for the SIM or the one faculty member with expertise in a particular area going on leave at the time that the student was to complete the thesis requirement. Members of the committee noted that procedures are in place to deal with the changes required by problems and that participation in the SIM program was not overwhelming the system. For those reasons, the Curriculum Committee chose to continue the Special Interdisciplinary Major program in its current form.

The reviews of the Theatre Arts Department and Humanities Program were deferred until the 2008-9 academic year.

II.   **Approval of New Programs**

The Curriculum Committee received a request to establish an Interdisciplinary Emphasis in Global Development. After review of the proposed program by a working group and discussion of the program by the Committee as a whole, the Interdisciplinary Emphasis in Global Development Studies was approved (2/15/08). Discussion of the program centered around a few major issues such as the overlap with existing programs and the impact of the program on staffing in departments.

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.

IV.   **Internships and Cooperative Education Programs**

In the 2006-2007 academic year, we began the review of the Internship and Cooperative Education programs. Some of the issues were resolved last year, but work remained to be completed this year. We gratefully acknowledge the help of Kim McDowell and Alana Jardis from Career and Employment Services in this process.

There are three ways that students can participate in an internship program, through the interdisciplinary Internship Seminar, through a departmental internship course, or with an individual faculty member. The members of the working groups both last year and this year sought a way to bring order and consistency to these very different ways of doing an internship. They defined the characteristics that made Internship an academic class, not an activity class, and set standards for internships guided by a faculty member. The guidelines accepted by the committee (4/18/08) are given in Appendix B.

The working group also revised the guidelines for the Cooperative Education Program, a program in which students may be employed either full or part-time and consider the relationship between theoretical and practical knowledge. Credit for cooperative

education is solely activity credit. Guidelines for Cooperative Education are given in Appendix C.

V.　　Ongoing Discussion of Connections Courses

Among the charges to the Committee this year was consideration of guidelines for the approval of courses proposed as meeting the Connections requirement. In particular, faculty members serving on the working group that reviews Connections course proposals found it difficult to determine what constituted interdisciplinarity and whether a single faculty member had the expertise to do justice in the teaching of two or more disciplines. Did having a series of guest lecturers cover the requirement for considering more than one discipline? Is it sufficient to study one discipline using the tools of another? Members of the committee were worried that consideration of these courses could vary from year to year, depending on the make-up of the committee approving them. Could we craft a set of guidelines for course proposers and reviewers that might make the process clearer and more consistent? After extensive discussion of the issues (), we decided that developing a set of guidelines would violate the intention of the faculty in the creation of the rubric for Connections courses. While the approval process may not be entirely consistent, firmer guidelines might prevent submission of courses that met the spirit of this core.

The on-going difficulty of designing courses that meet the rubrics as well as the problem of deciding whether a particular course meets the requirements of the core category was discussed in the review of the Connections core (see below and Appendix E). It remains an area of creative tension in the committee.

VI.　　Core Reviews

This year we reviewed the Social Science and Connections cores.

　　　Social Science Approaches:
Most faculty teaching in the Social Sciences are satisfied with the core and pleased with the courses that they teach. The one problem noted comes from the wording of the rubric. As the report (Appendix D) states, "Some concerns were expressed about the role of empirical evidence and the testing of models, however, and are worth mentioning here.

The core rubric specifies that students should acquire an understanding of the ways in which *empirical evidence* is used to *develop* and *test* theories about individual or collective behavior." Some faculty feel that the courses they teach use empirical evidence and develop and test theories, but don't always use empirical evidence to test theories. We may need to clean up the language of the rubric to reflect actual practice.

　　　Connections:
In the Connections review (Appendix E), faculty noted the problems of interdisciplinarity described above, but also noted problems of content, of team teaching and the large classes it requires, of the "Frankenstein" nature of the core (the melding of the old

Comparative Values and Science in Context cores). Some noted that as the whole curriculum becomes more interdisciplinary, having a core based on a requirement to be interdisciplinary is less necessary. There are suggestions that this core might be a place to engage large and pervasive issues that our students will face, for example, issues of race, gender, global warming. Faculty also affirmed the value of having a core taken by students late in their academic career.

The Committee suggests that review of the Connections core area continue in the fall.

VII.   Grading Period at the End of the Fall Semester

Finally, we considered the results of the experiment a previous Curriculum Committee foisted upon us. We violated the rules normally used to set the dates of semesters in the Fall, 2007 semester. The guidelines state that the last day of final exams should be no later than December 20. This year, finals ended on Friday, December 21, 2007. While the last day of final exams was late, grades were still due on January 2, 2008. Faculty had only 11 calendar days (four of which were Christmas Eve, Christmas, New Year's Eve and New Year's Day) for grading. We wondered whether that was a reasonable time for faculty to complete grading. We collected data about whether the number of late grades increased with the decrease in time to grade. We tried to find a way to give faculty the maximum number of non-holiday days to complete grades while being sensitive to the need to give students sufficient time to appeal dismissals due to low grades. In the end, we crafted the "Livingston Rule":

> That final grades be due by noon on the first Monday two weeks after the end of the Final Exam Period or January 2, whichever is later.

This gives faculty at least 16 calendar days to grade and students at least 7 working days to submit petitions for readmission in any given year (see Appendix F).

VIII.   Business to Be Carried Over to 2008-2009

1. Continue the discussion of the Connections core review, including discussions with all faculty, student input, and rubric guidelines (see review narrative).
2. Review departments and programs scheduled for 2008-2009: Asian Studies, Business and Leadership, Comparative Sociology, Economics, Humanities, International Political Economy, Music, Theatre Arts.
3. Core Reviews: Review the core curriculum as a whole including consideration of the foreign language requirement and requirement for three upper division courses outside the major.

Curriculum Committee
Disposition of 2007-2008 Agenda

I. Departmental and Program Reviews

11/02/07	International Programs
02/01/08	Classics
02/01/08	Honors Program
02/15/08	Art
02/15/08	Special Interdisciplinary Major
04/18/08	Education
04/25/08	Communication Studies

II. On-going business

Academic Calendar

10/12/2007	Full Academic Calendar for 2008-2009 and basic dates for 2011-2012 approved and ratified by the Faculty Senate.
04/25/2008	Approval of revision to calendar setting guidelines to have fall semester grades due according to the following schedule: Grades should be due no earlier than noon on the Monday two weeks after the end of the final exam period or January 2, whichever is later.

Action on core courses

10/12/2007	CSOC 107, The Anthropology of Social Collapse, approved for Scholarly and Creative Inquiry Seminar Core
10/12/2007	GEOL 113, Exploring the Solar System, approved for Scholarly and Creative Inquiry Core
10/12/2007	IPE 111, The Beautiful Game, approved for Scholarly and Creative Inquiry Core
11/2/2007	HUM 119, The Life and Times of Eleanor of Aquitaine, approved for Scholarly and Creative Inquiry Core
11/2/2007	IPE 405, The Idea of Wine, approved for Connections Core
11/2/2007	CONN 335, Race and Multiculturalism in the American Context, approved for Connections Core
11/2/2007	CONN 332, Witchcraft in Colonial New England, approved for Connections Core
11/2/2007	HUM 321, Ancients and Moderns: The Ulysses Theme in Western Art, approved for Connections Core
11/30/2007	COMM 109, The Rhetoric of Social Justice, approved for Writing and Rhetoric Seminar
11/30/2007	EXSC 124, Disasters, approved for Scholarly and Creative Inquiry Core
2/1/2008	PHIL 103, The Philosophy and Science of Human Nature, approved for Scholarly and Creative Inquiry Seminar
2/1/2008	IPE 132, The U.S. Empire, approved as a one-time offering for the Scholarly and Creative Inquiry Core
2/15/2008	HIST 129, Mao's China: A Country in Revolution, approved for the Scholarly and Creative Inquiry Core
3/28/2008	AFAM 109, Multiracial Identity, approved for the Writing and Rhetoric Core
3/28/2008	CONN 372, The Gilded Age: Literary Realism and Historical Reality, approved for the Connections Core
04/18/08	HIST 426, China from 1600, approved for Humanistic Approaches core
04/18/08	HIST 428, Japan from 1600, approved for Humanistic Approaches core

III. Other Curricular Business

11/30/08	Discussion of Connections core rubric interpretation
02/15/08	Approved an Interdisciplinary Emphasis in Global Development Studies
04/18/08	Revised First Year Seminar rubrics to include assignments addressing academic honesty (also see discussion in minutes of 02/29/08)
04/18/08	Approved revised guidelines for Internship and Cooperative Education

Core Reviews

| 04/18/08 | Accepted Social Scientific Approaches core review |
| 04/25/08 | Discussed Connections core review |

Interim Study Abroad Committee program approvals. Accepted the following changes:

09/14/07	School for International Training (SIT) Senegal approved as partner program
10/12/07	Remove Danish Institute for Study Abroad (DIS) summer program
10/12/07	ILACA London program moved from sponsored to partner status

IV. Business to be carried over to 2008-2009

Connections core review: Continue discussion of issues raised at 04/25/08 meeting, and in the Connections core review document, regarding the rubric and content of the Connections core area (see minutes and related attachment from 04/25/08).

Social Scientific Approaches core rubric: discuss possible change to the Social Scientific Approaches core rubric to clarify the use of empirical evidence (see minutes and attachments from 04/18/08).

V. Departmental reviews scheduled for 2008-2009

Asian Studies
Business
Economics
Comparative Sociology
Humanities
International Political Economy
Music
Theatre Arts

VI. Core Reviews scheduled for 2007-2008

Overall core review
Foreign language requirement
Upper division elective (3 units outside the first major) requirement

6/27/2007 GEOL 322   Environmental Hydrogeology
                       New course approved, effective Fall 2007

7/06/2007 ART 362   Byzantine and Islamic Art
                       Revised title and description approved.
                       New title: Art, Religion, and Power in Late Antiquity and Byzantium

7/06/2007 ART 363   Medieval Art
                       Revised title and description approved.
                       New title: Faith and Power in the Art of the Medieval West (7-14th century)

9/07/2007 PG 304   Law and Order: The Politics of Crime and Punishment
                       New course approved.

9/10/2007   Interdisciplinary Emphasis in Neuroscience
                       Revised requirements approved

9/10/2007 NEUR 201   Introduction to Neuroscience
                       Revised prerequisites and description approved
                       Current prerequisite: *BIOL 111 or permission of instructor*
                       Revised prerequisite: *BIOL 111 OR BIOL 101 with permission of instructor OR permission of instructor*

9/10/2007 HIST 346   China Since 1800: Reform and Revolution
                       Revisioned title and description approved.
                       New title: China Since 1800: 1600 to the Present.

9/13/2007 HIST 349   Women of East Asia
                       New course approved, effective Spring 2008.

9/13/2007 STS 341   Modeling the Earth's Climate
                       Revised description approved.

9/18/2007 BIOL 432   Advanced Genetics of Plants
                       New course approved, effective Fall 2008.

9/18/2007 HIST 368   The Course of American Empire: The United States in the West and the Pacific, 1776-1919
                       New course approved, effective Fall 2008.

9/21/23007 STS 344   History of Ecology
                       New course approved, effective Spring 2008.

9/24/2007 ECON 291   Behavioral Economics
                       Course approved, effective Spring 2008.

9/28/2007 CONN 351   Everything Causes Cancer—Statistical Arguments for Causation
                       Course removed from curriculum at request of proposer.

9/28/2007 BUS 280	Personal Finance
Revised number approved: BUS 300, effective Summer 2008.
The course may not be used to satisfy the Category A elective
requirement in business.

9/30/2007 HIST 346	China Since 1800: Reform and Revolution
Revised number approved: HIST 246

10-18-07 CSOC407	Political Ecology
New course approved.

10-30-2007JAPN 401/402	Fourth Year Japanese
Course removed from curriculum at request of department.

10-30-07JAPN 360	Japanese through Ficition and Film
New course approved; replaces Japanese 401.

10-30-07JAPN 380	Reading Modern Japanese Prose
New course approved;replaces Japanese 402

10-30-07 FL 205	Survey of East Asian Literature
Revised title approved: Great Books of China and Japan

10-30-07 FL 310	Premodern Japanese Literature
Revised title and description Approved
Revised title: Death and Desire in Premodern Japanese
Literature

10-30-07	FL 320	Modern Japanese Literature
Revised title approved: Self and Society in Modern Japanese
Literature

10-30-07	ENGL 465	Iraq War Discussion Group (0.25 activity unit)
New course approved for Spring 2008 only.

11-2-2007 THTR 485	Topics in Theatre Arts
New topic approved: Language and Performance
Effective Spring 2008

11-14-2007 HIST 348	Japan's Modern Century
Revised Number and Title approved:
HIST 248   History of Japan, 1600 to Present

11-16-07 PT 620	Neuroscience and Functional Neuroanatomy (1.5 units)
Revised unit value approved: 1.25 unit

11-16-07 PT 655	Principles of Cardiopulmonary Physical Therapy (.25 unit)
Revised unit value approved: 0.50 unit

Current prerequisites: PT 601, 605, 610, 615
Revised prerequisites approved: PT 601, 605, 625

11-26-07 ECON 330	Law and Economics
Revised prerequisites approved.

Current prerequisites: ECON 376
Revised prerequisites: ECON 170

11-26-07   ECON 380   Game Theory
Revised prerequisite approved
Current prerequisite: ECON 376 or permission of instructor
Revised prerequisites: ECON 170

12-21-07 ECON 104   Peasants, Commodity Markets, and Starbucks: Coffee in the
Global and Local Economies
New title approved: Peasants, Commodity Markets, and
Starbucks: The Economics of Coffee
Effective Fall 2008

02-05-08 EXSC 222   Human Anatomy and Physiology
Prerequisites: EXSCI 221
Revised prerequisites approved: *Prerequisites: None*

02-05-08 ENGL 132   Ecology of the Text
Revised title approved: Writing and the Environmental
Imagination.

02-06-08 CSOC 360   Sociology of Health and Medicine
New course approved, effective Fall 2008.

02-06-08 HIST 315   The Rise of European Fascism
Removed from curriculum at request of department.

02-14-08 PG 340   Classical Political Theory
Revised description approved.

02-14-08 PG 411   Seminar in Public Law
Revised title approved: Research Seminar in Public Law

02-14-08 PG440   Seminar in Modern Political Thought
Revised title approved: Research Seminar in Political Theory

02-19-08 ENVR   Bulletin Action
Name change approved:
Environmental Policy and Decision making
Bulletin Curriculum Review approved
Revised categories for required electives.
Revised units in each elective category.

02-19-08 STS 201   Science, Technology & Society: Antiquity to 1800
Course description change approved.

02-19-08 ENVR 210   Environmental Decision Making
Revised course number and description approved: ENVR 310

02-19-08 HIST 245   Chinese Civilization
Revised description approved

02-19-08	HIST 247	Forging of Japanese Tradition Revised description approved
02-19-08	STS 348	Strange Realities: Physics in the Twentieth Century CONN 348 New course prefix approved: STS 348
02-29-08	NRSC 201	Introduction to Neuroscience Revised prerequisites approved: *BIOL 111 or BIOL101 with permission of instructor* Revised course description approved.
02-29-08	ART 201	Visual Concepts II New Prerequisite approved: *Prerequisites: Art 101*
02-29-08	CLSC 309	The Roman Revolution New Course Approved
02-29-08	CONN 348	Strange Realities: Physics in the Twentieth Century CONN 348 New course prefix approved: STS 348
02-29-08	PSYC 370	Special Topics New topic approved: Special Topics: Positive Psychology
03-19-08	ART 366	American Art Course Removed from the Curriculum.
03-19-08	CONN 318	Crime and Punishment Course number revised: CONN 318
03-19-08	CONN 302	Ethics of Responsibility and Difference Revised Course Title approved: Ethics and Alterity
03-19-08	ENGL 360	Major Authors: Bronte and Gaskell Topic approved.
03-19-08	CHIN 101-102	Elementary Chinese New Course title approved. First Year Chinese
03-19-08	CHIN 201-202	Intermediate Chinese New Course title approved. Second Year Chinese
03-19-08	CHIN 260	Advanced Oral Expression New Course title approved. Situational Oral Expression
03-19-08	JAPN 260	Advanced Oral Expression New course title and description approved. Situational Oral Expression

03-19-08 JAPN 101-102   Beginning Japanese
                                New Course title approved.
                                First Year Japanese

03-19-08 JAPN 201-202   Intermediate Japanese
                                New course title approved.
                                Second Year Japanese

03-19-08 MUS 437   Advanced Composition
                                New course approved.

03-19-08 REL 410   Religion and Violence
                                New Course Approved

03-19-08 REL 364   Issues in Bioethics
                                New title approved: Basics of Bioethics
                                New course number approved: REL 292
                                New course description approved.

03-19-08 REL 290   Mysticism and Esotericism
                                Removed from curriculum at request of department.

03-25-08 IPE 312   Political Economy of African Development
                                New course approved.

04-04-08 REL 201   Tibetan Buddhism
                                Course approved for 2005-2006 as part of the Pacific Rim/Asia
                                Study-Travel Program

04-04-08 ENVR 320   Ecotourism as a Tool for Conservation & Sustainable Development in
                                 Sikkim India
                                Course approved for Pacific Rim/Asia Study-Travel Program

04-04-08 ART 323   Angkor Wat and Vijayanagara: a Comparison
                                New course approved for the Pacific Rim/Asia Study Travel
                                2005-2006 Program, effective Fall 2005 through Summer 2006.

04-04-08 PHIL 383   Contemporary Moral Philosophy
                                 Revised prerequisite approved.

04-04-08 MUS 370   Special Topics in Music History
                                New topic approved: Nationalism and Exoticism in Opera, 1874-
                                1935

04-04-08 MATH 260   Intermediate Applied Statistics
                                 Revised prerequisites approved.

04-04-08 HIST 249   Political and Cultural History of the Kansai Region
                                Course approved for the Pacific Rim/Asia Study-Travel Program.

04-04-08 PG 388   Comparative Nationalism in China and Japan
                            Course approved for 2008-2009 Pacific Rim/Asia Study-Travel
                            Program

04-18-08 HIST 309   European Peasants and Their World
                            Removed from curriculum at request of department.

04-18-08 JAPN 250   Popular Culture and Society
                          Approved prerequisite: *Prerequisite: JAPN 202*

04-18-08 JAPN 260   Situational Oral Expression
                          Approved prerequisite: *Prerequisite: JAPN 202.*

04-18-08 SPAN 201/202   Intermediate Spanish
                          Approved new prerequisite: *Prerequisites: Three years of high
                            school Spanish, SPAN 102, or permission of instructor required
                            for 201; 201 or permission of instructor required for 202.*

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.**

Appendix B.
Internship Guidelines

<u>General</u>
The University of Puget Sound offers students the opportunity to undertake an internship in order to:
- Apply cognitive learning in an off-campus work-related organizational setting.
- Extend knowledge acquired elsewhere in the curriculum.
- Reflect upon work experience within an academic context.

<u>Eligibility</u>
The eligibility of a student to undertake an internship will be determined by the Office of Career and Employment Services using the following criteria:
- Junior or senior class standing.
- Cumulative university grade point average of at least 2.50.
- A major or minor in a department, school, or program; or other academic preparation appropriate for the internship placement.
- Recommendation of the academic advisor.
- Approval from the chair or director of the department, school, or program for which the student will receive credit (if a faculty-sponsored internship).

<u>Requirements</u>
The requirements of the internship will be specified in the Internship Learning Agreement composed of an Academic Syllabus and a Job Description. The Learning Agreement must be completed; signed by the intern, the supervising instructor, the department chair or program director (for a faculty-sponsored internship), and the work supervisor; and submitted to the Office of Career and Employment Services before the end of the add period during the term in question. The student may then be registered.

The Academic Syllabus* should be comparable to the syllabus of any upper-division course in the curriculum and should include:
- A list of the academic topics or questions to be addressed.
- The learning objectives to be achieved.
- The reading and/or research requirements relevant to the topics and learning objectives.
- The assignments or progress reports (plus the dates they are due to the instructor) to be completed during the internship.
- The final project, paper, report, or thesis to be completed at the conclusion of the internship.
- A regular schedule of days and meeting times of at least 35 hours for the internship seminar. Or, a comparable schedule of at least 35 hours for consultation with the instructor and independent research in a faculty-sponsored internship. In either case, students should regularly review

their progress toward their learning objectives and should discuss how they are applying their previous courses and experiences to the internship.
- The date during the final examination period (or the date by the last day of the summer session) for the student to submit the self-assessment to the instructor unless arrangements have been made to extend the internship with an in-progress grade beyond the normal end of the term.
- The instructor's grading criteria.

*A student in an internship seminar will also have a seminar syllabus from the seminar instructor. The student should not duplicate the seminar syllabus in the Learning Agreement Academic Syllabus but must address those items specific to the student's particular internship.

The Job Description will include:
- A list of the specific job responsibilities and tasks relevant to the intern's academic learning objectives.
- A list of the specific job responsibilities and tasks relevant to the student's employment expectations although not directly related to the academic learning objectives.
- An employment schedule of at least 120 hours.
- The criteria used by the supervisor to evaluate the intern's job performance.
- The date by which the supervisor is to send the student's performance appraisal to the Office of Career and Employment Services.

Grading
An internship is intended to be a graded course (although a student may select pass/fail grading). However, the instructor of a faculty-sponsored internship may determine that, due to the nature of the experience and the job assignments, pass/fail grading is appropriate.

A student's performance in an internship will be assessed by the student's achievement on the academic requirements, as assigned and graded by the University faculty-member, and on the completion of work responsibilities, as evaluated by the supervisor at the organization hosting the internship. Additionally, the student may be required to complete a self-assessment reviewing the learning objectives, how they were achieved, and how that achievement was demonstrated.

Designation
- The internship seminar will be designated at INTN 497.
- The department-offered internship will be designated with the department abbreviation and the course number 497. (For example, the Writing Internship offered by the English Department is designated as ENGL 497.)

- The internship sponsored by an individual member of the faculty will be designated with the department abbreviation of the faculty member and the course number 498.

<u>Credit</u>
Credit for an internship is not applicable to the Upper-Division Graduation Requirement and only 1 unit may be assigned to an individual internship and no more than 2 units of internship, or the combination of internships with co-ops, may be applied to a bachelor's degree.

Appendix C.

Co-Operative Education Guidelines

<u>General</u>
The University of Puget Sound offers students the opportunity to undertake a co-operative education experience so students, through full or part-time employment, may:
- Gain pre-professional experience through academically-related off-campus employment.
- Gain relevant experience to provide context for later academic studies.
- Extend theoretical knowledge to practical application.
- Achieve work-related and academic goals in preparation for employment.

<u>Eligibility</u>
The eligibility of a student to undertake a co-op will be determined by the Office of Career and Employment Services using the following criteria:
- Sophomore, junior, or senior class standing.
- Cumulative university grade point average of at least 2.50.
- A declared major, minor, or interdisciplinary emphasis in a department, school, or program appropriate for the co-op placement.
- Recommendation of the academic advisor.
- Approval from the chair or director of the department, school, or program for which the student will receive credit.
- Total enrollment in co-ops is limited to 20 students per term.

<u>Requirements</u>
The requirements of the co-op will be specified in the Co-Operative Education Learning Agreement composed of a Job Description and Learning Objectives. The Learning Agreement must be completed; signed by the student, the supervising instructor, the department chair or program director, and the work supervisor; and submitted to the Office of Career and Employment Services before the end of the add period during the term in question. The student may then be registered.

The Job Description will include:
- A list of the specific job responsibilities and tasks assigned to the student.
- The criteria used by the employment supervisor to evaluate the student's job performance.
- The student's work schedule with start and end dates plus an outline of hours to be worked each day of the week.
- The day and time during the week that the student will meet with the supervisor to review job performance and progress toward learning objectives.
- The date by which the supervisor is to send the student's performance appraisal to the Office of Career and Employment Services.

The Learning Objectives should reflect the student's academic and professional interests and must specify how the student intends to achieve a pertinent experience by including:

- Specific intended objectives for undertaking the co-op.
- A description how each responsibility or task assigned by the employment supervisor can be made relevant to the intended objectives.
- A schedule of days and times for meeting with the instructor to review the student's assessment of personal job performance and progress toward the learning objectives.
- The date during the final examination period (or the date by the last day of the summer session) for the student to submit the self-assessment to the instructor unless arrangements have been made to extend the co-op with an in-progress grade beyond the normal end of the term.
- Any specific objective that may be assigned by the instructor.

Grading

A student's performance in a co-op will be graded pass/fail by the instructor using the employment supervisor's appraisal of the student's completion of job responsibilities (forwarded by the Office of Career and Employment Services); the student's self-assessment regarding the completion of learning objectives, how they were achieved, and how that achievement was demonstrated; and by any additional criteria the instructor assigned in the Learning Agreement.

Designation

- The co-operative education experience will be designated COOP 499 CO-OP EXPERIENC.

Credit

Activity credit will be granted for a co-op and such credit is not applicable to the Upper-Division Graduation Requirement. For a student employed half-time (at least 240 total hours), .25 activity unit will be granted with half-time enrollment status. For a student employed full-time (at least 480 hours), .50 activity unit will be granted with full-time enrollment status.

As activity credit, a co-op is included in the limit of 1.50 units of activity credit that may be applied to a bachelor's degree. Apart from the activity unit limit, no more than a total of 2.00 units of co-ops combined with internships may be applied to a bachelor's degree.

Appendix D:

Curriculum Committee
April 7, 2008

SOCIAL SCIENTIFIC APPROACHES CORE REVIEW

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Brad Richards (Chair), Alyce DeMarais, Leon Grunberg, and Elise Richman

Overview and Summary

Our review of the Social Scientific Approaches core area was informed by the syllabi from recent sections of courses in the core, faculty responses to our questionnaire, and our discussion with a group of faculty currently teaching in the core. The results of our review are summarized in this section, and are followed by the current objectives and guidelines for the core area, the faculty responses to our questionnaire, and notes from our meeting with faculty teaching in the core.

In general, we found that courses in the core are meeting the core objectives. The core is supported by a healthy number of courses, and draws from an interesting range of disciplines. Faculty teaching in the core are happy with the current objectives and guidelines, for the most part, and feel that their courses are satisfying the requirements for courses in the Social Scientific core area. Some concerns were expressed about the role of empirical evidence and the testing of models, however, and are worth mentioning here.

The core rubric specifies that students should acquire an understanding of the ways in which *empirical evidence* is used to *develop* and *test* theories about individual or collective behavior. This emphasis on empirical evidence was problematic for some courses, as illustrated by these two (separate) responses to our questionnaire:

"My biggest challenge in achieving the core objectives has been including a sufficient discussion of the ways in which empirical evidence is used to test the theories."

"The guidelines appear to require real empirical analysis of some sort or another (using data to test models). I can't say that this occurs in my course – no statistics analysis or regression analysis at this level. Obviously real empirical analysis does occur later in the economics curriculum. So….either we need to think about ways [of] introducing empirical analysis per se into

Econ 170 or the core rubric description needs to be written to allow for more general discussions of the use of empirical data with regard to model testing (something I do do in that course)."

This topic was explored in more detail during our meeting with the faculty teaching in the core. (See the notes at the end of this document.) Some faculty thought the current language proscribed the use of data too narrowly. Some felt that the word "model" was problematic, as the term is not used in all disciplines represented in the core, and does not accurately capture the theories of behavior in others. Suggestions included dropping the requirement that data be used to *analyze* a model, and introducing terms like "perspectives" or "hypotheses" to supplement or replace "model".

Our working group did not feel that these semantic issues were significant enough to warrant removing any courses from the core, or requiring any particular rewording of the rubric or guidelines. It is worth bringing to the attention of future review committees, however, and it may warrant discussion within the core about a preferred rewording.

Objectives and Guidelines

The Social Scientific Approaches Core Rubric:

> Learning Objectives: The social sciences provide systematic approaches to understanding relationships that arise among individuals, organizations, or institutions. Students in a course in the Social Scientific Approach to Knowing acquire an understanding of theories about individual or collective behavior within a social environment and of the ways that empirical evidence is used to develop and test those theories.

Guidelines:

> I. Courses in Social Scientific Approaches
>   A. explore assumptions embedded in social scientific theories and
>   B. examine the importance of simplifying or describing observations of the world in order to construct a model of individual or collective behavior.
> II. Courses in Social Scientific Approaches require students to apply a social scientific theory as a way of understanding individual or collective behavior

Faculty Responses

1. **Do you think that your students are aware of the purpose of the Social Scientific Approaches core area? How do your students learn about this core area?**

   – Most students at the beginning of the course seem to have a general sense of what the social sciences try to do. I think they learn about this core area from their

advisor or friends. Most awareness comes from introduction to the course on the first day.

– Yes, I think my students are aware of the core area, mostly because I go over it at the start of the course, discuss it in my syllabus, and return to discuss it throughout the term.

– I really don't know if students are generally aware of the social sciences core goals and objectives. I do not mention these goals in my syllabus or in my lecture/discussions per se though they are addressed in various ways throughout the course. Students learn about this core area by reading the bulletin and to some degree through advising and to some degree by word of mouth in conversations with other students.

– To be perfectly honest, I never mention or discuss the fact that the course (Econ170) is one that fulfills the "Social Scientific Approaches core" category. At no point during the semester do I explicitly or specifically identify or discuss the "Guidelines" for this core area. And, again, to be honest, I have never given any thought to how students learn about the actual guidelines for this core area.
    What's odd about my lack of discussion of the core guidelines in this area is how different I approach the same issue in my first-year writing and rhetoric seminar: in that class, I include the guidelines verbatim in the syllabus; we go over them the first class day; and I explicitly reference them over the course of the semester to provide the rationale and motivation for various activities and assignments.

– In my experience, students are aware of the Core rubric and the general nature of social scientific evidence. They do not, however, have a coherent understanding of the nature of theory and the role of theory in guiding hypotheses and interpreting findings. Most of my students have been sophomores. They selected my course from the list in the Bulletin "because it sounded interesting." The course does not appear to attract unexpected numbers of students from the sciences, arts, or humanities.

– Only those that have read the Bulletin carefully know what this (or any other) core is all about. My students learn more about this core area because I discuss it briefly on the first day of class. I am vested in this core specifically because I was the chair of the subcommittee that drafted the objectives and guidelines of the SS core all those years ago.

– I can only assume that they are aware of it in the sense that there is a core requirement that they have to fulfill. The extent to which they understand its general purpose is uncertain to me. But that they need to fill the core is clear to them.

- Yes, I think they are aware of the Social Scientific Core. Since the "social sciences" are a standard part of both high school and university curricula, I think the students are fairly well informed about, and prepared for, the social scientific core.

- No, I doubt students who enroll in Econ 170 have much real familiarity with the core purposes. If they have any it is because of advising or perhaps they remember reading something about it in the catalogue. They learn about the core area by advising and general information from the university.

- I think students understand that our distribution requirements are called the core curriculum, and that that have to take courses from that rubric. Beyond that I doubt that most students understand the criteria governing the Social Scientific Approaches category.

- Somewhat. I emphasize at the beginning of the course and throughout it that I want them to understand the methods and assumptions of social psychology, not just the interesting findings.

- I think students see core categories as menus and select courses that meet their interests and fit the category.

2) **Based on your experience and the assessment of information that you have collected, do you think that students have achieved the learning objectives of the Social Scientific core area? What assignments, teaching strategies, texts, etc. were most useful in helping students achieve the learning objectives of this core area?**

- Yes, I strongly believe that students in IPE 201 have achieved the learning objectives of this core area. The class textbook systematically examines relationships between individuals, organizations, and institutions internationally. Three major theoretical perspectives are presented (liberalism, mercantilism, and structuralism) and assessed with a variety of empirical evidence in tests and short writing assignments.

- Yes, I believe that for the most part my students have achieved the learning objectives. I think the texts and our thorough discussion of those texts have been the most useful for this.

- Econ 170 is ideally suited to satisfying the stated goals. The course is model and data intensive. The models are all designed to explain behavior of individuals as consumers and businesspeople and investors and as policy makers in the broader context of a mixed market economy. Almost all introductory economics textbooks are well-suited in this regard. I give two writing assignments that are particularly pertinent. The first one requires students to explain why the price of

some commodity has changed (as described in a news article of their choosing) using the market model (and the role played by consumers and businesses in that regard). The second assignment requires students to critique current Federal Reserve policy in light of their own assessment of the state of the economy based on their perusal of relevant commentaries and some data.

– Despite my lack of attention to the guidelines, I nonetheless am pretty confident I fulfill them and that the students achieve them. Indeed, a significant component of what I consider to be "my job" in that class is to introduce students to the language and methods of economics. That objective is stated in my syllabus and I reference it myself throughout the semester in class. I have them practice with the language and the tools, both orally in class and in a variety of written assignments. I frequently point out the unique aspects of my discipline, particularly how it might differ from the humanities or other social sciences. (I also point out what we borrowed from physics.) Perhaps because this objective -- that students understand the language and methods of economics -- is so central to my class while simultaneously fulfilling the core guidelines explains why I never considered any need to go over the guidelines with the class.

– The major assignment involves studying a campaign, collecting evidence regarding the campaign's success, and developing a theory-driven plan for improving outcomes. Students responded favorably to exercises on conducting literature reviews and interpreting primary evidence. The textbook I used in my last offering of COMM252 (Pfau & Parrot, 1997) is now out of print. I have located a new text that blends persuasion and media (Borchers, 2007). I believe that the emphasis on new media will be very attractive to our students.

– My IPE 201 course, which counts for the SS core, is designed to meet the learning objectives, and I believe that most students do achieve the learning objectives, though it is impossible to know for sure because they are never surveyed specifically about the objectives. The readings that I employ, especially the text by Dave Balaam and Mike Veseth (Introduction to International Political Economy), provide many empirical examples of the theories introduced at the beginning of the course, and issues discussed throughout the semester. Essentially, IPE examines the relationships between individuals, states, and institutions, so it lends itself, by default, to the objectives of the SS core. Finally, when I discuss research papers in class, I discuss the importance of bringing in empirical evidence since this is social science.

– Our course (PG 102) is built around a common syllabus (O'Neil, Fields, Share) and a common text we authored. We are confident that that material is organized toward the core objectives, particularly an understanding of institutions. Mixed lecture, discussion, in-class exercises and use of real-world examples (including student presentations) solidify their understanding and the relationship between theory and empirical evidence

– I teach a relatively traditional introductory economics course, but since it covers both the more technical/modeling aspects of economic theory as well as current economic issues/policies, I believe they get a good introduction to understanding how the social science of economics predicts/explains individual and collective behavior. The essay exams seem to do a good job of evaluating student learning in the course.

– Yes, the gain an appreciation for the social science approach principally because I introduce them to methods and approaches as part of the course material. The prime methods I use to introduce the ideas are from the text (most introductory economics texts cover these basic concepts) and lecture (I stress model building, assumptions, and the logic of the method).

– I am very confident that PG 102 explores assumptions embedded in social scientific theories and examines the importance of simplifying or describing observations of the world—that is the essence of PG 102. Whether they encourage or facilitates students' ability to construct a model of individual or collective behavior is questionable, but certainly PG 102 students come away from the course with a far better understanding of differences among major political systems, differences among major ideologies, and different models of viewing the world. My course is pitched at the introductory level, but I would still argue that PG 102 occasionally requires students to apply a social scientific theory as a way of understanding individual or collective behavior. In terms of specific assignments, PG 102 requires each student to write a final paper that includes a political science argument, using categories of analysis, and marshalling evidence to support argument. In terms of teaching strategies, PG 102 is built around three sets of country cases (UK/Japan, China/Russia, Iran/South Africa) and many classes are spent doing basic comparative analysis. Today, for example, I had my PG 102 attempt to answer the question: how can we explain the early democratization of the UK, and the very late democratization of Japan? I had student teams make arguments for different categories of analysis (political institutions, economic factors, international factors, and ideological and societal factors). As for texts, PG 102 is fortunate to use two texts written by comparative political scientists at Puget Sound. Patrick O'Neil's text introduces to the basic analytic concepts of comparative politics, while our co-authored set of cases provides the raw material for basic comparative work.

– Yes. I think assignments that require them to cite original source research send a strong message about the empirical nature of the discipline. They have to follow some conventions of APA style such as NOT using any direct quotations, but summarizing and citing evidence to justify arguments. I'd be happy to provide copies of these types of assignments if you want.

– Since this is the first time I have taught the course under the Social Science rubric, I have no information to contribute.

3) Based on your experience and the assessment of information that you have collected, how (if at all) would you change your course? How (if at all) would you change the core guidelines or learning objectives? Please comment in particular about any pedagogical challenges you encountered in trying to balance the core objectives.

– I am happy with the course as it is currently designed. I continue to make small changes from semester to semester. I continue to try to improve students' ability to gather empirical evidence and interpret it. I am pleased with the current core guidelines and learning objectives.

– As a philosopher teaching substantially philosophical texts, I have had great success in helping my students acquire and understand diverse theories and models of individual and collective behavior within a social environment My biggest challenge in achieving the core objectives has been including a sufficient discussion of the ways in which empirical evidence is used to test the theories. In the past, I have included texts by more empirical authors like Durkheim (e.g. Suicide) and this has proved very useful. But (especially as compared to e.g. Leon or Wade or Sunil, who are all social scientists), I have felt some tension with the suggestion that I am introducing students to the "scientific" aspect of the social approaches, and several of the authors I teach are skeptical of the assumption that individual and collective behaviour within a social environment can or should be treated "scientifically." I think that my course would be best described as an introduction to the origins and foundations of social science (as opposed a survey of contemporary work in the social sciences).

– The guidelines appear to require real empirical analysis of some sort or another (using data to test models). I can't say that this occurs in my course – no statistics analysis or regression analysis at this level. Obviously real empirical analysis does occur later in the economics curriculum. So…..either we need to think about ways introducing empirical analysis per se into Econ 170 or the core rubric description needs to be written to allow for more general discussions of the use of empirical data with regard to model testing (something I do do in that course).

– I wouldn't change the guidelines at all myself -- I think they convey exactly what we should be doing in that core area.

– Your questions, however, have brought to my attention the vastly different approach I take to them in comparison to my first-year seminar. I think I will do a better job of situating the social science core guidelines -- more explicitly -- in my class from now on.

– Although I've only offered it twice, COMM 252 is evolving. The greatest challenge has been conveying the logic of theory-driven hypothesis testing. Students seem to be unnerved by the notion of Type I and Type II error. I have addressed the issue of false positive and false negative findings by including an

assignment on formative pre-campaign research and descriptive on-going research. This helps them see how managers use theory to calibrate a campaign and assess outcomes at key moments.

– The only thing that I will probably change in the future is to link material back to the social sciences more often throughout the semester (i.e., talk about the value and particular approach of social science, and the objectives of the SS core). I believe the guidelines and objectives are sufficient as they stand (but then again, I am biased…see answer for question 1). Insofar as pedagogical challenges go, I have not experiences any related to trying to balance core objectives. As mentioned above, it would be impossible to teach IPE 201 without meeting the learning objectives of the SS core.

– I don't see any particular challenges, other than to reinforce the idea that what we are trying to do is to get them to master conceptual tools, not memorize (or chat about) facts or news that may be interesting now but not relevant later. This is pretty minor concern, however.

– I have no suggestions for how the core should be changed or improved. As for my own course, the science of economics may be on the cusp of some major changes in its theoretical practice and I would like to bring some of this new material about these changes into my introductory course.

– I don't really think there is any need to change the course or the leaning objectives. I can't imagine an intro level social science course that does not introduce methods and concepts. I do not think teaching to the objectives produces any problems in my course.

– I happen to think the PG 102 is an extraordinarily effective course within the Social Scientific core area. However, I would be dishonest if I pretended that I have ever considered the core guidelines in the design in developing PG 102. Over the past decade I worked with O'Neil and Fields to develop a common PG 102 curriculum, and we did so with sole goal of creating a foundation for the PG major and the comparative politics track. We are extremely proud of the course because we have first-hand evidence that we are achieving the common learning objectives we sought. For example, this semester I strictly required PG 102 for my PG 380 Latin American Politics course. I have students who have completed PG 102 with each of the three instructors. My students have a common vocabulary, a shared set of analytical skills, and an awareness of social science methods. As a result, I was able to make the redesigned PG 380 a real upper-division political science course, and students are responding well. PG 102 was part of the old International Studies core. When that category disappeared, and when we saw the new Social Scientific core, we thought that PG 102 would fit in it, but we were not willing to modify PG 102 to fit into the core. Since IPE unilaterally added PG 102 as a required course for that major, PG 102 has been in high demand, and we have a hard enough time finding seats for our own majors.

- I think the new core rubrics are actually better than the last ones in the sense that I can explain to students why it is so important that they understand the methods and forms of reasoning used in the discipline.

- I am working on how to balance theoretical concepts with students' experiences, both the ones they bring in to the class and shared exercises/simulations.

4) If you have taught transfer students in this core area, have you noticed any particular challenges?

- I have not noticed any particular challenges.

- I don't recall any special difficulties with teaching transfer students in this core area.

- I am not aware of any particular issues that are unique to transfer students in my Econ 170 course.

- Among those students who I know have been transfer students (that is, I may not know they are), I have encountered no challenges. A couple of them have been at or very near the top of the class.

- I have not taught a transfer section of COMM 252.

- I have not had very many transfer students in this core category. But based on my experiences teaching transfer students in all courses, I would say that many experience difficulties adjusting to the expectations of UPS. However, they are often eager to improve and to work with me on improving their performance. I guess the answer to the specific question above is no, this core in particular has not presented any challenges where transfer students are concerned.

- No. They are uneven depending on where they have come from, but that's not a core issue per se.

- I have not noticed any difference between transfer and non-transfer students.

- No.

- Transfer students present challenges, but none related to the core area. Many transfer students lack basic writing and analytical skills, are not used to the heavy work load, and some have not been well advised about their course selection.

- Haven't noticed.

- N/A

Meeting with Faculty

Social Scientifc Approaches (SSA) Core Review Discussion
March 3, 2008

In attendance: Brad Richards (chair, curriculum committee working group), Leon Grunberg (curriculum committee working group and SSA faculty), Elise Richman (curriculum committee working group), Alyce DeMarais (curriculum committee working group), and faculty members Nick Kontogeorgopoulos (IPE), Patrick O'Neil (Politics and Government), Ray Preiss (Communication Studies), Ross Singleton (Economics), and Carolyn Weisz (Psychology).

Brad opened the discussion by telling the group this was *their* review and posing the question: should SSA courses address all the objectives and guidelines in the rubric? Carolyn responded that she found the current rubric less confusing than the old rubric. Ross asked for clarification about whether data (empirical evidence) were required to address the models mentioned in the rubric. After we went over the SSA rubric, Patrick asked how the group could help the curriculum committee subcommittee with their work. Brad gave an overview of the review process and noted that changes to the rubric could be recommended.

Ross noted that the specific issue with the rubric was the notion of "constructing a model" (Guideline I.B.) and Leon agreed. Carolyn suggested that the word "model" may be the issue. She gave the example that in Psychology analytical and application pieces are applied but the term "model" is not used. Ross suggested the rubric could allow for a more general discussion of empirical data (not specifying that data be required to *analyze* a model).

After a review of the guidelines, Nick noted that they reflect the make-up of the group that developed the guidelines (chaired by Nick) and therefore contain areas from Economics, Psychology, Sociology, etc. Nick noted that empirical evidence can be used to back up claims and not necessarily to only test the validity of a model. Ray suggested we look at courses that were added to the SSA core under the new rubric (i.e., Ray's course Comm 252 *Public Communication Campaigns*). He noted that it was easier to design a new course to address the new rubric rather than trying to "retrofit" an existing course to fit the rubric.

Carolyn mentioned that staffing issues played a key role in precluding some Psychology courses from being listed in the SSA core. She noted that for a course to be in the core it needed to address the "ways of knowing" rather than containing specific content. She thought a disciplinary "way of knowing" fulfills the spirit of the core. Ray agreed that the core should not necessarily be a leverage point for departmental recruitment. Ross

noted that Econ 170 addresses the guidelines but not necessarily all the objectives; however, we consider it a good SSA course. Leon concluded that most believe in filling the spirit of the core.

Ross returned to the question of the language of the rubric and noted that "test" and "model" seem to be the two problematic words. Leon suggested the addition of "perspectives" or "hypotheses" after the term "model" and change "model" to "models." He explained that some sociologists are interested in understanding rather than causality.

Alyce asked if courses in the SSA core are taught differently than they would be if not in the core. Carolyn noted the broad range of students (but usually no first-year students – the course fills before they can register) in her Social Psychology course. She would teach the course differently if it was all majors and not in the core. Ray noted that the content in his course would be aimed at a higher level (300 level; juniors and seniors) if it was not in the core. Patrick noted that the P&G SSA courses would be the same if they were not in the core. They compare to similar courses taught across the country. He also noted that the national trend for these courses is to address the objectives we have in our rubric. Ross reported that Econ 170 would not change.

We talked a bit about assessment. Earlier in the discussion, Carolyn noted that she uses informal evaluations in her courses (mainly in Connections courses). She thought we could address the core objectives verbatim in the evaluations to determine if the courses were addressing the objectives. Patrick thought it would be fascinating to embed the core language in syllabi then assess through evaluations. He volunteered to try this in his courses in the fall. Carolyn noted that we could determine if we were: 1) not addressing the core objectives in the courses, or 2) were not being transparent about the objectives. Carolyn also noted that addressing the objectives of the core area diffuses the students' expectation of disliking empirical evidence discussions. Ray reported an assessment strategy that Communication Studies faculty members are using for their 400-level seminars. They collect three categories of student papers (good, mediocre, poor – my terms) and assess whether they achieve the goals/objective of the course. They use a Cascade "check-out" system that includes an assessment survey that the students must complete before the end of the semester. Patrick liked this strategy and noted that it would be an interesting mechanism for comparing multiple sections of the same course.

Respectfully submitted,
Alyce DeMarais

Appendix E:

DATE: April 24, 2008

TO: Members of the Curriculum Committee
FROM: Working Group III: Lynda Livingston (lead), Alyce DeMarais, Fred Hamel,
               Florence Sandler
               (with thanks for the tremendous contributions by our fall-semester member,
               Brad Dillman)

RE: Connections Review

Dear Members of the Committee:

We have spent a year fully immersed in Connections issues. We approved several courses, and
failed to approve one. It was in consideration of the latter that we most fully engaged the rubric
to consider what a Connections course should be. The issues that we faced (in one case, we took
the unprecedented step of bringing a course to the full Curriculum Committee), along with
responses to our faculty questionnaire and feedback from our spring-term meeting with many of
the Connections faculty, lead us offer the following comments to future committees. Notes from
the meeting with faculty are presented in Appendix A.

basics

♦ *the value of a senior-level core course*
The faculty present at the Connections review meeting strongly supported a core requirement for
the junior or senior year. While a few faculty members think an earlier requirement might help
students know how to approach interdisciplinary issues later when they are in their majors, most
felt that the current requirement forces students, even if uncomfortably, to take a look at the
world from a perspective outside their disciplinary boundaries.   It also reminds students that our
goal is to provide them with a *liberal arts* education. Several faculty suggested that some upper
divisions students find the course as a hoop to jump through.   This affects how faculty
experience the course - and may influence junior faculty to shy away from teaching Connections
courses.   Some stated that a small percentage of students in their courses were consistently
"checked out."   However, more than a few faculty argued that their Connections course(s) are
their favorite courses and they "rarely have a bad day" with them.   Several faculty agreed that a
student survey or focus groups regarding the Connections core is needed, and encourage the
subcommittee to conduct such work (in conjunction with Institutional Research).

♦ *explicit guidelines*
The guidelines for Connections, especially regarding interdisciplinarity, are difficult to apply. It
is sometimes hard for subcommittee members from different areas to evaluate or even identify the
different "lenses" a proposer will bring to material.[1] One special difficulty is the evaluation of
courses that use one discipline as the *object* of review by another discipline, rather than another
voice speaking (for example, are students reading articles about a discipline and then merely

---

[1] The "lens" construct has been used to assess Connections courses since their inception; however, its
definition and provenance are murky.

reporting on them, or are students truly *engaging* with that discipline?). The subcommittee longed for explicit guidelines, but recognizes that such guidelines might unduly restrict proposers. In addition, both the full Curriculum Committee and the Connections faculty expressed their faith in the subcommittee to make the necessary determinations. The use of previously approved courses is relevant here. The subcommittee reviews each course and rather than having a simple formula to apply, relies on earlier precedents (previous Connections decisions) to help interpret and apply the guidelines. It is therefore important to keep records about deliberations, including the rationales for course approval or disapproval. There seem to be three different types of Connections courses: 1) those team-taught by faculty members from different disciplines, 2) interdisciplinary courses taught by one person, and 3) topic-oriented courses that employ multiple approaches. Having a sense of these different models is important for the review process.

♦ *content*

The faculty at the Connections review meeting noted the "Frankenstein" nature of the Connections course, given that the rubric involves aspects of the previous Comparative Values and Science in Context core areas. While some faculty seemed more interested in perpetuating the Comparative Values part of the course, science faculty noted that they were happy to have the opportunity to explore issues that did not fit into more traditional science courses. Many faculty seem excited about the possibility that Connections could be restructured to address critical content (like race issues). This latter issue needs continued discussion.

logistics

♦ *team teaching*

Courses team-taught by professors from different disciplines are more easily recognizable as interdisciplinary to the subcommittee. (These professors need not be from different "ways of knowing"; a course taught by a psychologist and an economist would be considered interdisciplinary, for example.) However, a single instructor with the proper background can bring the required interdisciplinarity to a course. This point was echoed by those faculty who attended our Connections review meeting. One difficulty about team teaching, noted by the faculty, is the larger class size (44 students as compared to 22 students).

We are, however, unable to define "proper background." Review of the proposer's credentials and testimonials by other faculty were very valuable in our assessment. We hope that individual proposers of future courses will help the curriculum committee's reviewers by addressing this issue explicitly.

♦ *guest speakers*

The subcommittee applauds the use of guest speakers. However, we are uncomfortable approving courses whose interdisciplinarity appears contingent upon the availability of guest speakers.

♦ *students' group work*

It is not uncommon for instructors to plan to create working groups by drawing together students from different majors. However, this alone is insufficient evidence of interdisciplinarity (and it may be impossible to effect in practice).

Given these issues, we offer the following suggestions for future curriculum review:

1. The faculty should consider whether interdisciplinarity should be the focus of the course, or whether we may want to turn to a content focus (e.g., race, climate change).
2. Revision of the rubric should incorporate student input (perhaps through focus groups).
3. The faculty should consider the incorporation of skill requirement (e.g., writing).

Sincerely,

Lynda Livingston
Alyce DeMarais
Fred Hamel
Florence Sandler

Connections Core Area Discussion
04-16-08

Moderator: Lynda Livingston
Working Group: Fred Hamel, Florence Sandler, Alyce DeMarais (scribe)

Twenty-six faculty members, in addition to the working group members, joined the discussion of the Connections core area. Lynda opened the discussion, after introductions, by reviewing that the Connections core area was developed by the faculty and this review is designed to assess and "evolve" the core area through faculty input. The working group, on behalf of the Curriculum Committee, wants to assess the efficacy of the Connections rubric and the core area in general.

Derek asked for a brief summary of the written responses submitted by the faculty teaching in the Connections core area. Lynda summarized the responses for the question on interdisciplinarity. Fred noted that this was an area of ambiguity for the Curriculum Committee: the relationship between/among disciplines in a given course and how they are represented. Barry thought that students may receive the message that one discipline is favored over another based on the personalities of the instructors. Lynda wondered if this would be the case with one instructor. Robin noted that there is no simple answer to the question of interdisciplinarity. It depends on the intersection of material and, in some courses, one person can represent this well.

Derek wondered if we should rethink what Connections means. George suggested an interdisciplinary course should come sooner, perhaps during the first semester of the Sophomore year. He argued that Connections as a senior course seems out of place as seniors are immersed in their major fields of study. Florence reminded us of the intention of the Connections core: to challenge students, before they leave the university, that disciplines other than their own exist and interact. George noted that the core area doesn't work as designed because students from disciplines outside the ones covered in the course have difficulty engaging with the material in a meaningful way. Carolyn asserted that Connections works well as an upper division course. She noted that bringing together students with varied exposure to given disciplines is awkward but necessary as students may not move beyond their comfort zone on their own.

Barry noted that Connections is a "Frankenstein" course with a rubric cobbled together from Science in Context and Comparative Values. He asked what purpose we want this core area to have? What significant role do we want to fulfill? He asserted that we could leave the Connections core as a "placeholder" while the faculty determined what this core area should be. He noted that we are becoming interdisciplinary-rich in many areas; therefore, a single interdisciplinary course may be redundant or misleading. What is the function of a single, interdisciplinary course in an interdisciplinary environment?

Hans asked if we enjoyed teaching this course, noting that he does. Robin agreed and appreciated that she can teach students from across the university. While she agreed with George that it was difficult to bring all students into the discussion, she purposefully developed assignments that open dialog. She did not think this would work at a lower level. Andy agreed, noting that he can address questions that he couldn't in a Physics course.

David Tinsley expressed sympathy for the Curriculum Committee working group in approving courses when the rubric allows for "hopeless variety." He suggested we poll students regarding

their experience of the course. He noted that junior faculty members are often counseled to <u>not</u> teach a Connections course due to the potential for poor teaching evaluations. David noted that some students do not want a rigorous course and approach the course with a minimum of effort. David works hard to discourage this attitude in his Scholarly and Creative Inquiry Seminar. James provided anecdotal evidence that his classes went well and his evaluations for his Connections course were not different from his other courses. Jill mentioned that class size makes a difference. She likes to team-teach but finds the increased class size makes it less successful with students. Nick agreed with David that students can be resentful that they "have" to take an upper division core course. He enjoys teaching the course but finds it challenging because students don't want to be there. Tiffany noted that while her evaluations were good, the students were resentful about taking a challenging course, particularly given that she was teaching in the summer. As with Nick, Tiffany has also heard student refer to the Connections requirement as "a pain" and "a joke."

Lynda noted that faculty member responses indicated that students do not understand the purpose of the Connections core. Derek indicated that the rubric addresses process rather than content. Barry agreed that the rubric leaves the content to the faculty. He noted that we teach courses we feel good about but he wondered if the students agree. Nick noted that the upper division graduation requirement in bringing students outside their majors; therefore, Connections as originally conceived may not be necessary. Robin reported that her course became much more successful when she made it a writing course, removing discipline-specific assignments. She found the students engaged with the material more. Robin wondered if focusing on a mission-specific objective, such as writing, would be a more useful and understandable goal for this core area. Carolyn agreed that many students are not inherently interested in the interdisciplinary nature of the course "pick and choose" what aspects of the course they want to work on more than others.

Lynda then turned our attention to assessment of the course. Robin gave an example of how she assesses her course. On the first day of class students write about what they know about the themes of the course. As part of the final exam, students re-examine what they wrote on the first day and comment again. This technique allows for assessment of what students have gained from the course. David Smith noted that we should not assess students on papers only. He noted that some students may not have taken many humanities courses at the upper division level, for example, and therefore it is fairer to have a range of assessments. Julian gave an example of a mechanism he is testing in his course. The students present their "paper" on a poster. This provides a forum for peer evaluation as well as instructor evaluation. He also uses this strategy for providing peer feedback on the final paper proposals – the students present their proposals on the posters.

We then turned to the Curriculum Committee (CC) review of Connections course proposals. Lynda noted that the CC membership changes each year and, as a result, the guidelines can be interpreted differently each year. Julian observed that there seem to be three different types of Connections courses: 1) those team-taught by faculty members from different disciplines, 2) interdisciplinary courses taught by one person, and 3) topic-oriented courses that employ multiple approaches. Julian noted that the CC having a sense of these different models was important for the review process. Derek thought this is a result of having a rubric that does not specify content. He suggested we could insert language about content and making connections. For example, we could tie the course to other aspects of the campus such as the Civic Scholarship Initiative. In other words, Connections courses could be cross-disciplinary in other ways. Hans suggested that CC members, especially those on the working group charged with reviewing Connections courses, be screened for flexibility and tolerance. Fred suggested that we "let teaching happen."

Lynda asked if there is value in an upper division core requirement. Diane said there is value because we are challenging students to think in a different way. Nick noted that we should not just do what students like, or are comfortable with. Barry noted that the three unit upper division requirement fulfilled this objective; however, Diane does not think this requirement challenges the students as much as Connections. Barry suggested a checklist of the pros and cons of the Connections core, including resentment of students and lack of junior faculty participation (due to the worry of poor evaluations). Florence recalled that though she was skeptical of the "two discipline" focus at the outset of the implementation of the "new core" but finds it remarkable how many of the faculty responding to the recent questionnaire saw that definition as helpful. She noted that the rubric stemmed from a political compromise but the outcomes are exciting. Jim Evans spoke in favor of an upper division core course. We should be more ambitious than letting students settle into their majors, retreating into disciplinary strongholds. Zaixin spoke eloquently and passionately about how exciting the experience of teaching Connections has been for him. He relished the "topics beyond imagination" and the responsibility to challenge students and give them the opportunity to grow.

Dexter Gordon relayed that he and Grace Livingston had taught a Connections course for the past four years. They are dismayed that students in their courses are ready to graduate yet it is the first time the students have encountered material, especially on issues of race. Dexter urged us to ask, "What are the basic elements we should ensure all our students encounter?" A student can take courses in the Ways of Knowing but still not encounter issues of race. In the Connections course, students interrogate their own disciplines through the lens of race via education, cultural studies, and rhetorical studies.

Tiffany asked why Connections courses must be interdisciplinary. She noted that there is more to the liberal arts than interdisciplinarity and wondered if we could rethink the core requirement but move the courses faculty love into the departments and programs. We should have a conversation about what we want the junior/senior experience to include, especially regarding issues of diversity and race. She noted that we confront complacency with these courses but students remain complacent. Nick suggested we have focus groups with students to determine whether we are achieving the goals of this core area. Alyce noted that Randy Nelson is doing this. Carolyn reported that she had assembled her own advisory committee when she developed her course. She did not want to team teach because of the size of the class and she felt it was impractical to bring in colleagues too much. She suggested that support for visiting faculty in these courses would be helpful.

At 6:00 PM Lynda noted the time and closed the meeting. She thanked everyone for participating. She noted that the discussion will continue as we did not resolve some important points. She invited feedback from the faculty.

Post-meeting notes:
- Alyce: continue this review next year, evaluating the purpose of the Connections core, including discussions with all faculty, not just those teaching in the core area (perhaps two or three discussion forums early in the fall); also, work with Randy Nelson to include student opinion and assessment.
- Robin: what kind of skills do we want students to leave with (such as writing)? These skills transcend the disciplines and could be embraced by many courses at the upper division level.

- James: think about the purpose of the Connections core area; does it need to be outside of disciplines (for example, Physics of Music is offered within Physics but draws a lot of students from other majors).
- The discussion continued for quite some time after we adjourned. Could this core area morph into a discussion of the "other" (race, class, gender, with, perhaps, religion and ethnicity).

Appendix F: Data Relating to the Discussion of the Length of the Fall Semester Grading Period.

Sheet 1 of the Excel Spreadsheet gives the number of days in the grading period and the number of grades submitted in each year.

Sheet 2 shows the trend of the number of days for grading and the number of days for student submission of petitions for readmission.

Academic Year	Fall Final Exams End	Calendar Days Between	Non-Holiday Days Between (Alyce)	Grades Due	Count of Late Grades
2001-2002	12/14/2001	18 days	14	1/2/2002	441
2002-2003	12/20/2002	12 days	8	1/2/2003	1174
2003-2004	12/19/2003	16 days	12	1/5/2004	593
2004-2005	12/17/2004	16 days	12	1/3/2005	1024
2005-2006	12/16/2005	17 days	13	1/3/2006	1169
2006-2007	12/15/2006	17 days	13	1/2/2007	621
2007-2008	12/21/2007	11 days	7	1/2/2008	1565
2008-2009	12/19/2008		9	1/2/2008	

So here's the correlation with the corrected data (calendar days between and # of la

Sarah

Correlations

		Days	No__ate
Days	Pearson Correlation		-.790*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.035
	N	7	7
No_Late	Pearson Correlation	-.790*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.035	
	N	7	7

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 leve (2-tailed).

Calendar Days Between	Sanction Meeting	Working Days Between	Spring Semester Begins
1 days	**1/4/2002**	10 days	**1/22/2002**
4 days	**1/7/2003**	8 days	**1/21/2003**
1 days	**1/7/2004**	7 days	**1/20/2004**
1 days	**1/5/2005**	7 days	**1/18/2005**
0 days	**1/4/2006**	7 days	**1/17/2006**
0 days	**1/3/2007**	7 days	**1/16/2007**
0 days	**1/3/2008**	11 days	**1/22/2008**
	1/5/2009	9 days	**1/20/2009**

ate grades), still largely driven by outlying observations.

May 2, 2008

TO: Faculty Senate
FR: Peter Greenfield
      Faculty Advancement Committee
RE: 2007-2008 Annual Report

The Faculty Advancement Committee this year will have completed 57 evaluations:

Type of review	Number of evaluation files
Tenure	3
Tenure and promotion to associate	5
Promotion to associate	6
Promotion to professor	6
3-year assistant	12
3-year associate	5 (4 streamline)
5-year professor	10 (3 streamline)
3-year instructor	8
Total	55

In addition, the Dean completed two three-year visiting assistant professor reviews and, at the request of the department, a review for a long-term adjunct instructor. There are evaluations to be forwarded to the Board of Trustees at the May 2008 meeting as well as evaluations still in process. At this point in time, 52 faculty members are scheduled for evaluation in 2008-2009.

The Advancement Committee met four hours per week from October 11 - December 20 and January 30 – March 28; the Committee has met six hours per week during April and May and hopes to conclude its work for the 2007-2008 year by May 14. Committee members' work outside of meeting times is extensive, estimated at 40 hours per month.

Issues and Recommendations
1. The primary concern of the Advancement Committee is junior faculty participation in open file reviews. The participation of all tenure-line colleagues in departmental and program reviews is a long-standing and highly valued practice at Puget Sound. Evaluees have long had the option of open or closed files for evaluations other than the tenure evaluation. The recent vote by the faculty to extend the option of open files to tenure evaluations has raised the salience of the issue of junior faculty participation in all open file reviews. Since the vote to extend open files, FAC has observed more guarded letters being submitted, particularly by junior faculty, and a general reluctance on their part not to weigh in on change of status evaluations. We strongly encourage the faculty to reconsider the open/closed files issue.

2. Fourteen files came in after published deadlines, some significantly late, which has made it difficult for the FAC this year to complete groups of files in order that evaluation letters could have been provided to colleagues in a more timely manner. Some delays cannot be avoided, but the FAC asks that department chairs work with

evaluees more proactively to avoid situations in which (a) an evaluation has to be delayed a semester because the course evaluations required by the Code are not available, or (b) priority is simply not given to completing the file by an evaluee or by a head officer. It is especially important that pre-tenure faculty who plan to apply for junior sabbatical leaves make sure that they will have four semesters of course evaluations available for the tenure review.

3. Two recommendations summarized in the FAC May 2007 report have been implemented:

  - The faculty in December 2007 approved a Faculty Code amendment to permit a designated member of the FAC to assist the Dean with streamlined reviews. This amendment was approved by the Board of Trustees at its February 2008 meeting and each member of the FAC has assisted with one streamlined review this spring.
  - The faculty in April 2008 approved a Faculty Code amendment to permit alternate 3-year Instructor reviews, for those Instructors with 17 or more years of service, to be conducted using the streamlined process. If this amendment is approved by the Board at its May 2008 meeting, the change will take effect for 2008-2009. Implementation of this change would have primary impact on the workload of departmental colleagues; for the FAC, the change would mean that up to eight files this year might have been reviewed by one member rather than multiple members of the Committee.

4. The FAC continues to request that departmental colleagues attend to procedural matters in the preparation of letters, including: (a) accurately dating their letters, (b) specifically documenting class visits, (c) making sure evaluation letters are signed, and (d) following PSC-approved departmental guidelines. For example, if departmental guidelines state that class visits occur in the two semesters prior to the evaluation date, then a pattern of visits that occurs only in the two weeks prior to the departmental deliberation is inadequate. Each time the FAC has to stop its work to check-in with a department on matters of procedure, or document variations in procedure, the committee's work is slowed.

5. The Advancement Committee continues to note disparity in departmental guidelines with respect to expectations for professional growth.

6. The FAC suggests that departments and/or the Professional Standards Committee consider how to provide guidance to the Advancement Committee regarding assessment of scholarship published digitally. The breadth of such work is vast, and departments may simply say that such work is evaluated with the same measures as traditional scholarly or creative work (peer reviewed or not, solicited or not, significance within the professional, etc.). Guidance on such questions, which would also benefit faculty members coming up for evaluation, should come through revisions to departmental guidelines.

University Enrichment Committee
Faculty Senate Report
April 30, 2008

2007-2008 UEC Membership:
William D Barry, Suzanne Holland, Renee Houston, Michael Johnson, Sarah Moore (ex-officio), Mark Reinitz (Chair), Leslie J Saucedo, Maria L Sampen, Eric A Scharrer, Amy G V Spivey, Susan M Stewart, Matt Warning, Paula Wilson, Rand Worland

The senate charges to the 2007-2008 University Enrichment Committee were:

1. Review proposals for travel and research from faculty and students
2. Review proposals for faculty release time.
3. Select recipients of the Dirk Phibbs Memorial Award and the 2009 Regester Lecturer
4. Discuss and decide whether faculty travel for duties related to professional organizations should be supported by UEC funds
5. Consider streamlining the faculty conference travel funding process
6. Assess whether the size of the committee is appropriate

Committee actions regarding Senate charges

Usual duties related to travel, research, and release time awards

Faculty Travel Funding. As of this writing, UEC funded 82 first-trip faculty travel requests for a total of $89,846 (mean reimbursement per trip = $1095).   In order to cover these first trips it was necessary to borrow $15000 from a different (Dean's) fund; at present there is a balance of $ 9102.16 in the faculty travel budget which should be enough to cover remaining first-trip requests for this fiscal year. (Any remaining funds will be returned to the Dean.) Given that we did not have sufficient funds to cover first trips with the regular BTF allocation, there were no remaining funds to help cover second trips.

Faculty Research Funding. The committee received 25 faculty research grant proposals, and 23 were funded for a total of $27,082. This amount far exceeded the 16K in new monies we received this year to fund faculty research.

Release Time Requests. The committee received 14 applications for teaching release units. The committee formulated a rank-ordered list of the top 7 applications and sent this to Dean Bartanen for her decision. Five RTs were initially available but Dean Bartanen found another, so 6 faculty received RTs.

Student Research and Travel Funding. The committee awarded 69 student research and travel grants for a total of $32,023 (mean award per grant = $464.11). This amount exceeded the 30K in new monies that we received to fund these grants this year.

Selection of Register Lecturer for 2009

After reviewing the work of several outstanding nominees, the Committee concluded that Suzanne Holland's scholarly contributions and teaching excellence made her an exemplary representative of the University community. Holland was chosen as Register Lecturer.

Selection for the Dirk Andrew Phibbs Award

The committee reviewed faculty activities funded by UEC research grants, and on the basis of this review voted to name Peter Greenfield as the Phibbs Scholar.

Discussion about travel funding for professional duties

After extensive discussion the committee agreed that the term "professional duties" was very broad, and it was therefore inappropriate to make a blanket decision about funding travel to support them. General sentiment on the committee was that travel to present at professional conferences should receive priority over other types of travel. The committee approved a change in the wording in the 'Conference Participation' document, such that the following sentence was added: "A petition may be made for 100% funding if the faculty member is serving on the board of the professional organization or as a program planner." The committee will consider petitions on a case by case basis.

Discussion about streamlining the faculty travel funding application process

The committee compared our funding process with those at comparable schools. The committee decided that the current procedure is appropriate, and that other models tend to render faculty "poorer" such that the average size of travel grants is reduced.

Discussion about committee size

The committee agreed that the appropriate size of the UEC is 15 faculty members, although we did discuss the possibility of reducing to 12 members. Much of the committee's work is done in subcommittees (e.g., different subcommittees review faculty research grants, undergraduate research grants, and graduate student research grants). A committee size of 15 faculty members is sufficient to create subcommittees with sufficient diversity of expertise to fairly assess proposals from the arts, humanities, sciences, and social sciences. Furthermore, nominal committee size is sometimes misleading; for instance this year we had one member on maternity leave, another on sabbatical, and another who was excused because she was on two committees.

Recommendations for next year's committee

At our final meeting the committee proposed two areas that should be considered by next year's UEC committee:

1. Discuss the Phibbs award selection process to determine if the current process is fair and is consistent with the donor's intentions in the Memorandum of Understanding.
2. Review Professional Development application procedures, forms, and documents for UEC-funded awards. In particular, the current committee thought that it would be useful to make sure that all UEC selected proposals have a paragraph at the outset that summarizes the research methods, clearly indicates why the research is important, and indicates what will be done with the requested funds. In addition the proposal that six, rather than nine, copies of proposals be submitted should be considered.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Reinitz
 UEC Chair

Professional Standards Committee
End-of-year Report
AY2007-2008
May 5, 2008

The members of the Professional Standards Committee (PSC) for AY0708 were Sigrun Bodine, Julie Christoph, Julian Edgoose, Karl Fields, Barry Goldstein, Don Share, George Tomlin (chair), and Dean Kristine Bartanen (ex officio).

The PSC met 23 times during AY0708. The year began with 16 charges from the Faculty Senate. The PSC acquired 9 further charges from September 14, 2007 through March 19, 2008. Of these 25 charges, 15 were completed (Charge #1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 19, and 20- with Senators' indulgence I'll continue this cross-referencing of charges for the PSC's internal tracking purposes), one was completed except for a small item to be carried over to AY0809 (#15), two were deferred pending further deliberation by other university entities (#13, 21), one was returned to the Faculty Senate (#24), and 6 were advanced to next year (#7, 8, 18, 22, 23, and 25). These charges were addressed as noted below.

Code Amendments

The PSC brought three Faculty Code amendments to the faculty this year.

On December 3, 2007 the faculty passed an amended amendment concerning the handling of streamlined evaluation files by the Dean of the University. In its revised form the amendment allows the Dean to request help from a member of the Faculty Advancement Committee (FAC) for the review of a file (Chapter III, Section 5, d.). This amendment was approved by the Board of Trustees at its February 22, 2008 meeting.

On January 28, 2008 the faculty approved a list of Code "housekeeping" amendments that corrected typographical errors, out-dated internal references, or inconsistencies in the text of the Code. This amendment was also approved by the Board of Trustees at its February 22, 2008 meeting.

On April 22, 2008 the faculty approved an amendment to the code (Chapter III, Section 5 a.), permitting streamlined evaluations for full professors in their 35th year of university service, and in alternating evaluations for ongoing instructors who have served 17 years of more in that rank. This amendment will be considered by the Board at its May 2008 meeting.

Formal Interpretations of the Code

Two formal interpretations were issued by the PSC this year.

On April 4, 2008 the PSC decided that the use of "spouse" and "mate" in two prior code interpretations (of September 26, 1986, and October 16, 1989) should be understood to mean "spouse or domestic partner."

On April 18, 2008 the PSC issued an updated version of the "lost" interpretation of 1998, which had been inadvertently dropped from the list of existing interpretations when the Code was revised (in 2002, we believe). This 1998 interpretation held that a five-year evaluation of a full professor did not

entail "altering the status of the faculty member's appointment," and that therefore the process was not subject to the appeals procedure described in Chapter III, Sections 6, 7, and 8. The newly issued form of this interpretation merely repeated the interpretation's original wording, with the exception that all Code internal references were updated.

Both interpretations were forwarded to the Faculty Senate on April 22, 2008.

Non-Formal Interpretations of the Code

Three non-formal interpretations were delivered by the PSC this year.

On September 14, 2007 the PSC responded to an inquiry by concluding that any letter submitted in a faculty evaluation process by an emeritus/emerita faculty would be treated as an external letter, that is, it has to be submitted to the head officer of that evaluation.

On January 25, 2008 the PSC affirmed that the evaluation letters written by the head officer in a new faculty member's 1st and 2nd year review are not to be circulated by the chair, in draft or final form, among other departmental, program, or school colleagues. The evaluee retains the right to do so.

On February 8, 2008, in response to an inquiry from the FAC, the PSC determined that the Code does not require that separate summary letters be written by the head officer in an evaluation when internal and external letters are submitted. The Dean was asked to convey this finding to the FAC, and to invite the FAC to advise the PSC how significant an issue this matter has been.

Review of Departmental Faculty Evaluation Guidelines

Revised faculty evaluation guidelines from the Communication Studies department were approved September 7, 2007.

Note: just after last year's report to the Faculty Senate, the PSC approved revised evaluation guidelines from the Foreign Languages and Literature department on May 7, 2007.

Changes to the PSC's "Faculty Evaluation Criteria & Procedures" booklet, the "Buff" Document

Nine topics covered in the buff document were deliberated over by the PSC this year. Clarifications were drafted and approved for inclusion in the 2008-2009 edition. These topics were (1) that evaluations are both formative and summative in nature, (2) that letters from faculty emeriti are considered outside letters, (3) that "need" for a faculty member undergoing tenure evaluation refers to need "for the position," (4) that course materials may be submitted electronically to the FAC or posted electronically with access permission, (5) that non-departmental teaching should also be considered when departments are planning classroom visits for colleagues under evaluation, (6) procedures for evaluating 3-year visiting faculty, (7) references to the new streamlined evaluation procedures for ongoing instructors (once this Code amendment is approved by the Board of Trustees), (8) affirming that classroom visits and writing a letter were permitted but optional for colleagues during a streamlined faculty evaluation, and (9) several small items of advice for faculty members preparing their file and for colleagues writing letters.

Confidential Matters

During AY0708 no hearing boards were formed and no grievances were heard by the PSC.

Review of Proposed Campus Policies

On October 19, 2007 the PSC provided feedback on two draft policy documents: the new, integrated document on harassment and sexual misconduct, and the Dean's policy statement on shared faculty appointments (split appointment between two married faculty members or two faculty members in a domestic partnership). In the case of the latter document the Dean agreed to bring the revised draft back to the PSC before making it final.

Miscellaneous Matters Brought to the PSC

A draft policy on running backgrounds checks on faculty was brought to the PSC by the Human Resources department originally in May, 2007. The PSC review has been deferred due to further revisions undertaken by Human Resources.

The Dean of the University brought an inquiry to the PSC on February 7, 2008 from a faculty member who complained about sexually harassing comments appearing on student evaluations of faculty. The PSC discussed some of the ramifications of this phenomenon, and began a list of possible remedial steps, when it decided to defer the topic until after the Faculty Senate's survey of the faculty on evaluations was complete.

On February 22, 2008 the Faculty Senate asked the PSC to consider taking a charge to bring more uniformity to the expectations for professional development in departmental evaluation guidelines. Members of the PSC felt that it was the committee's role to ensure that departmental guidelines did not violate provisions of the Code, but not to enforce greater uniformity. The PSC returned this opinion to the Senate on March 10, 2008.

On March 19, 2008 Associate Dean Ferrari informed the PSC of the discovery of a document from the 1990s titled "Research Misconduct Policy," which the university had agreed to comply with for the sake of our receiving federal funding for a research grant at some point in the past. The Associate Dean asked if the document should be reviewed by the PSC before being posted on the campus web. The PSC chair decided this review was a good idea, given that the provisions of the discovered document may overlap or even conflict with policies of the university's Institutional Review Board and procedures in the Code. This matter was immediately deferred to AY0809.

PSC Self-Assessment

The PSC granted itself a non-formal waiver in order to perform a streamlined self-assessment at its last meeting for the year on May 2, 2008.

A. Committee Size
    1. Seven faculty and the Dean of the University serve on the PSC. The number is ideal for deliberations about the Faculty Code, policies and procedures, and faculty evaluation guidelines. The number is insufficient to conduct routine business in a timely fashion in years when there are multiple grievances filed. The PSC recognizes that it has only been the lack of

grievances and departmental guideline reviews this year that has allowed us to clear a majority of the backlog of Code and other document issues before the committee.

2. The PSC estimates that members spent an average of 6-8 hours per month on committee work. It is appropriately distributed among all members in that the chair, who manages the agenda, is spared the responsibility of taking minutes during the meetings and preparing them for dissemination. The chair does serve on subcommittees of the PSC as needed.

3. The committee as a whole meets weekly for an hour, from early September through early May. Subcommittees are convened as needed and meet varying amounts of time throughout the academic year.

4. The size of the PSC and its meeting schedule were optimal for accomplishing much this year. From our experience this year (and from the experience of several senior members of the PSC) we project that in years where many departmental evaluation guidelines need reviewing, or when a grievance is filed, the PSC as constituted currently would need to defer much necessary work that was not acute.

B. Committee Membership

1. This is a faculty committee with the Dean of the University in ex officio membership. The Dean can play an important role providing information, and acting as a go-between to the FAC. In selecting new faculty members for the PSC, the academic deans and the Faculty Senate executives seek a balance of disciplinary representation. PSC members noted that it can be very useful to have a junior faculty member on the committee, but that it could be very problematic for a non-tenured faculty or instructor to be elected to the role of chair (chairing grievance proceedings). Senior members of the committee noted that of utmost importance is that each member, during grievance resolutions, be able to think independently. The PSC recommends the continuation of broad departmental representation, since the committee's deliberative work would be significantly impeded should a grievance arise from a department that had two sitting members of the PSC. The recusal of two members from the PSC during a hearing would constitute a troublesome loss in numbers.

2. The mechanism for the selection of committee members is appropriate.

C. Committee Organization

1. The PSC has a chair who is elected by the members of the committee. This process is important for the inner dynamic functioning of the committee.

2. The chair, in consultation with other members of the committee, sets the agenda for the PSC, including prioritizing the long list of important tasks charged. As the resolution of most of these items involves a process of many stages, including consultation with and reporting to several other standing committees, university entities, or the Faculty Senate itself, the chair spends considerable time monitoring the status of agenda items and ensuring that they are properly completed and reported.

3. The Dean can play an important role as provider of institutional information, and participates as an equal member in all deliberations from which she has not recused herself.

4. In the business conducted by the PSC this year (a year without grievance proceedings), we have reached consensus in our deliberations, and we have not needed to resort to a majority vote.

D. Committee Responsibilities

1. The jurisdiction of the PSC is adequate and appropriate. Deliberating over the charges to the committee is challenging, fascinating, and important. Since the work of this committee is

by definition open-ended in magnitude, we humbly recommend restraint from all parties wishing to add to the PSC's workload.

2. The Senate in the past has discussed splitting the PSC into two entities: one that deals with hearing board formation and grievances, and one that handles all the other administrative and "judicial" work of the committee. Current members recognize the wisdom of preserving the arrangement by which experiences in the one role can inform judgments in the other. We can appreciate as well as anyone that the workload, in a year busy with all types of these responsibilities, would not be manageable. Therefore, below we suggest two ideas for the Senate's consideration, which could prepare the committee better for those years- surely to come- when the workload is vast.

E. Conclusions

The committee has functioned well this year and we are grateful for what we have been able to achieve. We recognize that much of this achievement was enabled by our ability to focus on the backlogged agenda.

F. Recommendations

1. The PSC would like to suggest to the Senate that they discuss whether this committee should have an official "vice-chair" or "chair-elect" who can take over for the chair as needed, and who can be prepared for a year in advance for the duties of chairing the committee.

2. The PSC would also like the Senate to consider whether there should be formed a pool of former members of the PSC, who agree and are elected by the faculty, to stand-by as "members-in-waiting." Should the need arise beyond the capacity of the regular PSC membership to fill the panels resolving grievances, then and only then would the members-in-waiting be called. Some revisions of the Code or the By-Laws would probably be necessary in order to create such a mechanism.

Charges Suggested for Next Year's Committee

1. Draft a Code amendment to clarify the definition of "tenure-line faculty" (Chapter I, Part B, Section 1). Some progress was made this spring toward the item. (Charge #7 in AY0708).

2. Draft a Code amendment revising and clarifying the process to be followed when an evaluee makes informal and formal challenges to the evaluation conducted by a department, program, or school (Chapter IV, Section 4 b. (4)). Some progress was made this spring. (Charge #8 in AY0708)

3. Revisit the issue of criteria for early tenure and promotion. A PSC interpretation of the existing Code was decided upon last year on February 12, 2007, was delivered to the Senate on April 23, 2007, and has not yet been formally taken to the Board. The discussions of members of the Board of Trustees and of the Faculty Senate seem to have led the thinking into a realm where a Code amendment would be required. (Charge #23 in AY0708)

4. Draft a Code amendment specifying the "constitutional" standing of formal Code Interpretations issued by the PSC: how they are displayed in the Code itself, how to alter their status as they become obsolete, and how to reconcile Code amendment processes with issuing new interpretations that supersede old interpretations. Discussion of this topic by the PSC has ensued this year in the wake of faculty deliberations over the proposed Code housekeeping amendments. (Charge #22 in AY0708)

5. Issue a Code Interpretation or draft a revision to the buff document or the green faculty hiring guide covering interdisciplinary faculty appointments, so as to ensure that the appointment letter specifies the procedure for later evaluation of that faculty member. The PSC has discussed this issue extensively this year. (Charge #18 in AY0708)

6. Review the "Research Misconduct Policy" document and suggest changes to existing documents as needed to achieve consistency among the various response processes in the case of research misconduct. (Charge #25 in AY0708)

7. Complete the drafting of examples of evaluation file text for university service for the buff document. (from Charge #15 in AY0708)

8. Conduct other business as usual. (Charge #1 in AY0708)

Gratefully submitted,

George Tomlin
Chair, Professional Standards Committee, AY0708

Date: April 28, 2008
To: Faculty Senate
From: Nick Kontogeorgopoulos, Chair, Student Life Committee
Subject: Student Life Committee Final Report, 2007-2008

Committee Members:
Becca Bryant (student representative)
Lisa Ferrari (ex-officio, representing Academic Dean, Spring semester)
Emma Green (student representative)
Cathy Hale (Psychology)
Glynnis Kirchmeier (student representative)
Nick Kontogeorgopoulos (International Political Economy)
Jan Leuchtenberger (Foreign Languages and Literature)
Mita Mahato (English)
Jac Royce (Theater Arts)
Mike Segawa (ex-officio)
Carrie Washburn (ex-officio, representing Academic Dean, Fall semester)

The Student Life Committee (hereafter SLC) met during the 2007-2008 academic year to discuss the following charges from the Faculty Senate (the bulleted points come from the list of goals set by the SLC at the end of 2006-2007; at the beginning of this year, the Senate asked the Committee to incorporate these goals into the four SLC charges):

1. Provide input on various Student Affairs projects and initiatives as brought to the Committee by the Dean of Students.

   ● Follow up more rigorously and consistently the work of Student Affairs committees that request input from the SLC.

2. Establish ongoing communication with and provide input to ASUPS on various projects at the request of that body's executives.

   ● Work more closely with ASUPS in order to allow ASUPS officials to bring projects to the SLC for faculty input.

   ● Discuss a request brought forth by a student member of the SLC to explore the possibility of an alternative, service-oriented Spring Break program. Last year, two UPS students organized such activities during Spring Break. The SLC plans to discuss this idea further and explore whether this can be made into a more regular opportunity (perhaps arranged through the Community Involvement and Action Center (CIAC)).

3. Review information sources available that could help identify issues relevant to student life. Such information sources include individual faculty, students, and staff, as well as the Office of Institutional Research and the ASUPS Student Concerns Committee.

   ● Better inform faculty, students, and staff of the role of the SLC, and in particular, the ability of any member of the campus community to bring to the Committee issues of concern related to student life.

- Establish an ongoing relationship with Institutional Research that would continue beyond this year and provide a steady flow of information helpful in identifying long-term issues. These could then be addressed by the SLC in addition to emerging issues that are brought to its attention throughout the year.

4. Provide a pool of faculty from which to draw for participation on Student Affairs ad hoc committees.

The remainder of this report will discuss the work completed by the SLC and will structure the discussion according to the charge under which specific activities fall. (Please note that much of the description of what the Committee accomplished is taken verbatim from the minutes of our meetings, recorded by our secretary, Jan Leuchtenberger.)

Charge #1: Provide input on various Student Affairs projects and initiatives as brought to the Committee by the Dean of Students.

Below is a list of Student Affairs projects or initiatives discussed by the SLC:

- *Sexual Assault Policy*. Mike Segawa asked the Committee for its input on the new Sexual Assault Policy that was being drafted. The driving force behind the new Sexual Assault policy was feedback from students that the existing policy is not supportive to survivors. Some of the major issues that are addressed and changed in the new policy are: What is sexual assault? What is confidentiality? What is consent? How can the adjudication process be made fairer?

- *Student Affairs Budget Task Force*. Mike Segawa reported to the SLC that the Student Affairs Budget Task Force had asked for the following items:

  a) Increased allocation for contracted personnel (psychiatrists and physicians) for CHWS. Hourly rates have been going up so the number of hours that can be covered with the existing allocation has gone down. The request is being made so that existing staffing levels can be maintained.

  b) Money to maintain the orientation program. Food costs have gone up and some grants have expired, so additional money is needed to cover the existing program.

  c) Money to upgrade the sound system in Kilworth Chapel, which has been failing recently at important events.

  d) Funds for emergency preparation and more first-aid kits for Residence Life staff. These funds would cover emergency/CPR training and putting the staff on the same phone system that is used by Campus Security. Some SLC members asked about existing emergency plans, in view of recent shootings at Virginia Tech and locally at Foss High School. Mike said some systems are in place but others are still under discussion.

- *Residential Seminars*. Mike Segawa gave SLC members the results of a comparison survey of residential seminars and regular, non-residential seminars that showed very encouraging results for the residential seminars. These results are only based on five seminars, but another survey will be conducted this year on the ten that now exist. There was an impressive increase among residential seminar students in confidence with research, and Committee members wondered if the same students also have increased skills in research (or whether the confidence was misplaced, as was discovered in other research conducted by Peggy Burge, Humanities Liaison Librarian; several SLC

members had heard about this research from Peggy during a "Wednesday at 4" session in the Center for Writing, Learning, and Teaching). The Chair contacted Peggy about whether it was possible to examine the results of the Research Practices Survey and sort students who have taken a residential seminar versus those who have not in order to assess whether a residential seminar increases both research confidence *and* skills among students. Unfortunately, Peggy informed the SLC that of the students who were enrolled in a Residential Seminar in Fall 2006, only seven filled out the Research Practices Survey for both the fall and the spring, thereby yielding a sample size too small to draw any conclusions.

Charge #2: Establish ongoing communication with and provide input to ASUPS on various projects at the request of that body's executives.

At the end of last year, the SLC felt that it was important to work more closely this year with ASUPS in order to allow ASUPS officials to bring projects to the SLC for faculty input. Several actions were taken to promote this goal of closer interaction and more consistent communication:

- The SLC Chair requested that Becca Bryant, ASUPS senator and Chair of the Student Concerns Committee, be appointed as one of the three student representatives on the SLC.

- In the Fall, the SLC Chair met with ASUPS President Hart Edmondson and ASUPS Vice President Matt Bonniwell to inform them about the role of the SLC and to let them know that they could solicit faculty input from the Committee on ASUPS initiatives and projects.

- In April, 2008, the SLC Chair met with Yusuf Word, the newly-elected ASUPS President. At this meeting, the Chair explained the role of the SLC, and discussed the possibility of ASUPS changing its bylaws to require a member of the Student Concerns Committee to serve as one of the three student representatives on the SLC. This would ensure a constant flow of information from the ASUPS Student Concerns Committee and the SLC. In the meeting, the Chair also suggested that the ASUPS President consider appointing student representatives in the Spring to avoid a long delay in having student representation on the SLC in the Fall (which is what happened during the 2007-2008 year). Finally, the Chair suggested to Yusuf that we consider having a faculty member of the SLC—or several members on a rotating basis—serve as the Faculty representative to the ASUPS Senate next year.

One goal, or subset of Charge #2, that the SLC had hoped to discuss was a request brought forth by a student member of the SLC last year to explore the possibility of an alternative, service-oriented Spring Break program. The Committee was unable to take up this issue this year, but it has been added to the Committee's suggested charges for next year (listed at the end of this report).

Charge #3: Review information sources available that could help identify issues relevant to student life. Such information sources include individual faculty, students, and staff, as well as the Office of Institutional Research and the ASUPS Student Concerns Committee.

In an effort to better inform faculty, students, and staff of the role of the SLC, and in particular, the ability of any member of the campus community to bring to the Committee issues of concern related to student life, the SLC took several actions:

- *Faculty*. In its discussion of how students and faculty currently express their concerns regarding issues related to student life, the SLC observed that most faculty who have concerns about student life usually contact Mike Segawa's office, while students either go to his office or bring concerns to the appropriate committee of ASUPS. SLC members agreed that the Committee was more of a 'big issue' group in which representatives from the whole campus community (faculty, students and

staff) could give input. After seeking advice from Alyce DeMarais, Associate Dean, on ways in which issues being discussed by the SLC could be brought to the attention of the entire faculty, the Chair asked that a 'list of issues' being considered by the SLC be included in the Committee's minutes. The Chair also attended a faculty meeting in the Fall, making a brief announcement about the list of issues and soliciting input from faculty interested in any of the issues.

- *ASUPS Senate*. On September 11, 2008, the SLC Chair will attend the first ASUPS Senate meeting of the year in order to inform the student senators about the role of the SLC, and to encourage senators to bring issues of concern related to student life to the SLC.

- *ASUPS Student Concerns Committee*. After some consideration of possible ways for students to bring concerns related to student life to the SLC, it was decided that a good mechanism is already in place for that process: the ASUPS Student Concerns Committee. The SLC also concluded that issues brought to it should be of a broader kind that would impact students widely, since there are other outlets on campus for concerns at the individual level.

- *Staff Senate*. In September, the Chair corresponded with Jada Pelger, Chair of the Staff Senate, to ask that she convey the following message to the Staff Senate (a class schedule conflict prevented the SLC Chair from attending the Staff Senate meeting in person): "the Student Life Committee, which is a standing faculty committee that serves as a consultative body for Mike Segawa, the Dean of Students, is a place where any staff member can raise issues related to student life (i.e., student life as it relates to co-curricular and extra-curricular activities). Please inform staff members that they can contact me directly if they wish to bring up an issue of concern related to student life."

As a result of fostering more consistent communication between the SLC and ASUPS (discussed above under Charge #2), the SLC was able to discuss several issues that stemmed from comments made by students to the ASUPS Student Concerns Committee. These issues include:

- *Counseling, Health and Wellness Services (CHWS)*. In September, Terry Beck, Faculty Senate liaison to the SLC, attended a SLC meeting and mentioned that during discussion of the SLC's charges, the Senate brought up the possibility of the Committee doing a review of CHWS and how it compares to similar services at peer institutions. Though Student Affairs had traditionally conducted reviews of all its programs every five years, the review process itself had come under scrutiny recently and Student Affairs was re-evaluating the process. CHWS would have been reviewed under the old system this year, and will be the first in line once the new process is in place. The suggestion for a review came from the student representative to the Faculty Senate independent of the usual review process, and was aimed at comparing the UPS service with those of other universities. The SLC members felt that the kind of review being proposed would best be done over the course of a year by an Ad-hoc committee, and would probably be too much to add to the ongoing business of the SLC.

  By coincidence, one of the issues raised by the Student Concerns Committee during the year was student complaints or questions about CHWS. SLC members suggested that Becca Bryant, SLC student representative and Chair of the ASUPS Student Concerns Committee, contact the relevant staff of CHWS to express concerns and set up a meeting with them so that they could begin framing a conversation on the issues.

  Later in the year, after meeting on several occasions with the other members of the ASUPS Student Concerns Committee, Becca met with Don Marshall, representing CHWS, and received the following answers in response to particular student concerns:

Concern: *Confidentiality issues*. Students who work at CHWS sign confidentiality agreements but some students are concerned about access to confidential medical files.

Response: Inappropriate viewing of records can result in firing, and CHWS is extremely vigilant about those records and the rules.

Concern: *The role of students working at CHWS*. Having so much student involvement at an undergraduate institution seems inappropriate and may lead to errors.

Response: Appropriate protocol is in place for medical mistakes.

Concern: *The need for more nurses during flu season.* Waiting times during flu season get so long that students often give up and go off campus.

Response: Budgetary constraints do not allow this.

Concern: *The need for a psychologist that specializes in weather-related mental health issues and homesickness*.

Response: All psychologists are licensed in the field and have completed all but final year before PhD. CHWS is currently planning on hiring new psychologists and students are welcome to participate in the interview process.

Concern: *The frequency with which students are referred off-campus*. Students suggested that if these referrals were unavoidable, there at least be a closer relationship between CHWS and one or two clinics so that paperwork could be minimized and there could be more direct communication between CHWS and the clinic.

Response: CHWS offers same-day appointments for acute problems. Students can call at 8 am and appointments are usually filled by 10 am. It is often more efficient to refer off campus. Regarding the need for a stronger relationship with off-campus clinics that would provide for the smooth transfer of records, it was suggested that students contact Linda Iverson in CHWS with any ideas on how to improve this.

- *Trail*. In the Fall, the ASUPS Student Concerns' report indicated that some students had expressed concerns that the *Trail* is at times unprofessional in its treatment of news. SLC members observed that it was difficult to supervise the *Trail* because there is no journalism department on campus and because it is run by an independent entity of ASUPS and therefore subject to decisions of ASUPS. The Chair contacted the Media Board and David Droge, *Trail* advisor, to raise this issue, noting that the concerns about a lack of professionalism came from the ASUPS Student Concerns Committee, and not the members of the SLC. Professor Droge indicated that without university curricular support for journalism, it was difficult in practical terms to have ongoing training workshops for *Trail* editors and staff. He also noted that despite some connections to local journalists who have indicated a willingness to host UPS students at the *News Tribune* office, the *Trail* staff has found this arrangement difficult because the calendar and schedule for producing the Trail are very tight, and getting to the *News Tribune* offices during the regular business day would be a problem for a staff that produces the paper mostly during the evening (since the staff consists of full-time students). After receiving this response, the SLC noted the good work being done David Droge in advising the *Trail*, and was grateful for the information that he passed along to the Committee about

the ways in which specific incidents or problems with *Trail* policy are addressed by students, administrators, and faculty.

- *KUPS*. The ASUPS Student Concerns' report also brought up the problem of KUPS playing potentially offensive music when there were visitors to campus. The SLC Chair, who is also faculty advisor to KUPS, spoke with the General Manager of KUPS, and a reminder was sent to all DJs reminding them of the station's policy on playing, or using, offensive language on the air.

- *The Readership Program*. This program provides free issues of the *New York Times* and the *Tacoma New Tribune* to students and is funded mostly by ASUPS. The concern expressed in the ASUPS Student Concerns' report was that newspapers were being taken by faculty and staff when they are meant for students only. Mike Segawa explained that when the program began several years ago, funding came from a number of different departments, and there were always enough newspapers because it was still new. Currently, most of the funding is from ASUPS and on many days, there are not enough copies of the *New York Times* for all students who want them. As a result, a sign was put up by ASUPS in the SUB asking faculty not to take the newspapers. Then-ASUPS President Hart Edmonson informed the SLC that ASUPS was pursuing funding for more newspapers, rather than asking faculty not to take them.

In order to establish an ongoing relationship with Institutional Research that would provide a steady flow of information used to identify long-term issues, the SLC worked all year with Randy Nelson and Kate Cohn in the Office of Institutional Research. The issue that the SLC discussed extensively this year, and particularly the Spring semester, was engagement and learning outcomes among study abroad students. The remainder of this section is devoted to summarizing the work done by the SLC on this issue.

The issue of engagement and learning outcomes among Puget Sound students that study abroad first came up during the second SLC meeting of the year, when a member of the Committee commented that there seemed to be a need to find a way for returning Study Abroad students to have more opportunities to share their experiences with the campus and the community at large. The faculty members of the SLC agreed that there was a lot of anecdotal evidence suggesting that students who had studied abroad in some cases felt disengaged from campus life, or at the very least felt that there was little interest among other members of the campus community in their experiences. This discussion was enhanced by the participation on the SLC of two student representatives who were planning to study abroad, and one student who had just returned from studying abroad.

In order to explore possible outlets for Study Abroad returnees to share their experiences with other students—so that others will benefit from their experience and so that they can more easily re-enter the campus community—the SLC invited Jannie Meisberger from the Office of International Programs to attend a meeting and share information regarding what is currently done to welcome back students who have studied abroad. Jannie noted that there is a difference in adjustment for students coming back at the end of spring, who have the summer to adjust, and those who come back at the end of Fall and need to jump back in immediately. Jannie described the "Welcome Back Celebration" that is currently held twice a year for students returning from study abroad. The celebration replaces an older "re-entry workshop" that did not attract many students. The celebration gives the students a chance to be formally welcomed home by the Dean and to share their experiences with friends who went to other places. Also, one student who has been back for a year is asked to talk about the re-entry experience.

Dave Wright is asked to attend and give students tips about how to get involved with social justice issues since so many come back influenced by what they see abroad. A Committee member asked if students were given opportunities to talk about their individual experiences at the celebration, and Jannie responded that the program is brief but that students could mingle afterwards. A SLC member pointed out that the issue is not only how we can help the students with re-entry, but also how the campus can

benefit from their experiences. Jannie said there is a mandatory questionnaire students fill out about their experiences and those are available in the International Programs office for other students to read. They are read by Jannie and one other staff member to evaluate specific programs and student issues.

In a later meeting, the SLC noted that the International Programs questionnaire that is now administered to students immediately after their study abroad experience has concluded gathers information mostly related to a particular program and the rigor of courses. In particular, there is only one open-ended question that touches on engagement or learning outcomes: "*In what ways can you measure your academic growth as a result of taking these courses? (e.g., if you were in a language program how do you rate your proficiency level now? How did you cope with different teaching styles and expectations? What is your level of confidence in doing independent research?)*". Other than this question, the existing 'post-arrival' survey features no questions related to student engagement or learning outcomes.

The SLC also asked Randy Nelson from the Office of Institutional Research to provide data from existing surveys that may shed light on the impact of studying abroad on student engagement and learning outcomes. Randy handed out to SLC members a summary of the results he found in a comparison between students who went on study abroad and those who did not. He took the data from the NSSE (National Survey of Student Engagement), which is given in spring to freshmen and seniors, and from the Senior Survey, which is given in spring to imminent graduates. The summary includes differences that are consistent over two years. Some of the results are included below:

a) In the NSSE, the only questions whose answers showed significant differences between those who had studied abroad and those who had not related to students' evaluation of their own general education. Those who had been abroad "rated their growth as greater than non-study-abroad students."

b) From the Senior Survey, "those who had studied abroad were more likely than those who had not to rate work for social change as an essential consideration when selecting a career. Those who had not studied abroad were more likely than those who had to value high potential income and a stable, secure future as important or essential career considerations."

c) Also from the Senior Survey, "seniors who had studied abroad were more likely than those who had not to have reported great growth in their ability to read or speak a foreign language; appreciate art; relate to people of different races, nations, and religions; place problems in a historical perspective; and function independently. Those who had not studied abroad were more likely than those who had to have reported great growth in their ability to evaluate the role of science and technology in society."

The conclusions that Randy reached from his analysis of the data were as follows: "Some of the differences between the groups might be attributable to the selection processes and curricular limitations related to study abroad. To be eligible for study abroad, students must maintain an adequate GPA (non-study-abroad students had lower GPAs). In addition, students in certain majors (e.g., sciences) find it difficult to study abroad due to the curricular demands of their major. This probably accounts for the difference on the question related to science and technology. Overall, the group differences are consistent with what might be expected from the experiences of study abroad. Apart from lower satisfaction with financial aid packages, there is little evidence to suggest that participating in study abroad results in social or academic adjustment issues."

Randy surmised, and the SLC agreed, that the existing surveys are not tailored enough to study abroad students to yield conclusive or thorough information on the impacts of studying abroad on student engagement and learning outcomes.

In light of information passed along to the SLC by Jannie and Randy, the SLC took the following actions:

a) Requested that the Office of International Programs send out a list of returning study abroad students to all faculty members to let them know who in their classes might have relevant experiences to share. This was done in the past, but discontinued several years ago. Jannie agreed to do this, beginning in the Fall of 2008.

b) Asked the Office of Institutional Research for a list of all students who have studied abroad in the past several years. This list, in Excel spreadsheet format, will be available to all members of the Puget Sound community (i.e., Cascade username and password required) as a link on the webpage of the Office of International Programs. The purpose of this list is to serve as a database of sorts for students, or faculty, who are interested in communicating with students who have studied abroad in particular countries on programs. The list includes names, email addresses, majors, minors, programs, countries, and the semester during which the students studied abroad. Kate Cohn produced the initial Excel document, which lists all 800 students that have studied abroad in the past three years. Mike Segawa's office will send an email to all students on the list and ask whether they would be willing to be contacted by staff, students, or faculty regarding their study abroad experiences. By September 1st, the list of students who have given their consent will be posted as a link on the International Programs' website. This list will be updated once each semester, and names will be purged after five years.

c) Created a pre-departure survey for students about to study abroad (see SLC Appendix One – Pre-Departure Study Abroad Survey). There is currently no information on the reasons that students study abroad, or more generally, on engagement or learning outcomes among students who choose to study abroad. For this reason, the SLC spent many meetings designing the pre-departure survey. In addition to creating its own questions, the SLC also incorporated questions on engagement and learning outcomes from the NSSE, Senior Survey, UPS Supplemental Questions for the Senior Survey, and the questionnaire that is now given by International Programs to students at the conclusion of their study abroad program. Hearing from Randy that the software required by Institutional Research to create online surveys—using online surveys drastically cuts down the time and effort required to collect and analyze data—had been requested from OIS long ago, but was part of a long queue, the SLC decided instead to utilize the Dean of Students' subscription to *SurveyMonkey* to create an online pre-departure survey. After being introduced to the basic features of *SurveyMonkey* by Yoshiko Matsui, the Chair took the survey designed by the Committee and created an online version. With the cooperation of Jannie and Jan in International Programs, the survey was placed on the list of 'things to do' before students could leave for their study abroad programs. The SLC Chair attended the pre-departure meeting on April 21st and gave a brief presentation on the reasons for the survey. That evening, the Chair sent the online survey to all 138 Puget Sound students that are studying abroad in the Summer or Fall. As of April 28th, the date of this report, 100 students had already completed the survey.

It should be noted that in order to ensure that the SLC was not duplicating work done elsewhere, the Chair attended a meeting of the Interim Study Abroad Committee (ISAC) to solicit feedback on the three tasks listed above. The members of ISAC enthusiastically endorsed the work of the SLC and assured the Chair that the work being done by ISAC did not overlap with the work of the SLC. Finally, after a great number of assurances, and meetings, the International Programs staff also recognized that the work being done by the SLC was not adding in any way to an already heavy workload.

Charge #4: Provide a pool of faculty from which to draw for participation on Student Affairs ad hoc committees

There was only one Student Affairs ad hoc committee that required faculty representation this year: the Exclusive Use Committee, on which SLC members Jan Leuchtenberger and Mita Mahato served as faculty representatives. The Exclusive Use Committee assessed three applicants for two available Union Avenue houses; one was most recently the Sigma Nu House and another was most recently the Beta house. Both Sigma Nu and Beta were applying to get their houses back after committing some infractions, and another group called "Uber Outhaus" was applying for a house for the first time. Uber Outhaus comprises a number of campus groups focused on outdoors activities and had collected the signatures of over 30 students who were willing to commit to living in the space. The Exclusive Use Committee met three times to discuss all of the issues and finally concluded that Beta would get its house back, and Sigma Nu also would get its house back if it satisfied certain conditions: the house must be completely alcohol/substance free, it must have the minimum required occupancy, and Sigma Nu must agree to have an RA from outside of the fraternity.

Looking Forward

At its final meeting, the SLC discussed its charges for next year, and would like to propose the following charges (with explanations, where appropriate, in parentheses):

1. *Revise Article V, Section 6f(b) of the Faculty Bylaws (Student Life Committee duties).* [Last year, the SLC developed four charges that were deliberately open-ended, flexible, and did not replicate the work being done by other faculty committees. The reason that we sought flexibility in our charges is because the Committee is not always aware at the end of the previous year which initiatives, projects, or issues that the Dean of Students will need to bring before the Committee for discussion or advice in the coming year. Thus, the Student Life Committee's charges this year were broader than the charges for other committees, but they worked well this year for the Committee. However, it would appear that these charges, listed at the beginning of the report, would serve very well instead as permanent reminders of the duties of the SLC. This would also make more specific what are, currently, quite vague duties listed in the Faculty By-Laws.]

2. *Request that ASUPS changes its bylaws to require (or at least recommend) that a member of the ASUPS Student Concerns Committee serve as one of the three students representatives on the Student Life Committee.*

3. *Review the progress of the Residential Seminar program and provide recommendations for its future.* [As part of this charge, the Student Life Committee will solicit data from the Research Practices survey, from Peggy Burge, Humanities Liaison Librarian, in order to assess whether a residential seminar increases both research confidence and skills among students.]

4. *Provide input to the Dean of Students on how to best structure the process of self-studies, or reviews, for departments within Student Affairs.* [The Student Affairs Division's departmental review process was discontinued last year, and will be revised once the process of re-accreditation is over.]

5. *Analyze data from the Summer/Fall 2008 study abroad pre-departure survey, and revise the survey as needed.*

6. *Design a post-arrival study abroad survey to be given to students approximately six months after arriving back at UPS from studying abroad.* [This survey will both gauge what impact studying abroad has had in terms of learning outcomes, in light of the data collected in the pre-departure surveys, and gather information on student engagement after returning from studying abroad.]

7. *Ask the staff of the Office of International Programs to set up a system whereby faculty members receive, each semester, a list of students who have just returned from studying abroad.* The SLC should also draft a note to faculty receiving this message (and list) from International Programs on ways in which they may utilize the list.

8. *Ensure that the Excel spreadsheet which lists returned study abroad students is posted, by September 1st, as a link on the International Programs website.*

9. *Communicate on a regular basis with the new International Education Committee (approved by the faculty at its April 22nd faculty meeting) about survey data being collected by the Student Life Committee from the pre-departure and (eventually) post-arrival surveys.*

10. *Establish regular correspondence between members of the Student Life Committee and campus committees that address issues related to student life.* [For example: the Budget Task Force; the Center for Writing, Learning, and Teaching; Career and Employment Services; Community Involvement and Action Center; Counseling, Health, and Wellness Services; Media Board; Multicultural Student Services; Orientation Planning Committee; Spirituality, Service, and Social Justice; Student Development; and Student Diversity Center.]

11. *In consultation with the Community Involvement and Action Center (CIAC), discuss the possibility of an alternative, service-oriented Spring Break program.* [This is left over from this year since the Student Life Committee did not get a chance to discuss it.]

12. *Review and provide recommendations for the development of a Leadership Development program that spans all four years of a student's Puget Sound experience. As part of this process, the Dean of Students shall appoint a faculty member of the Student Life Committee to serve on the "4-Year Leadership Development Curriculum Plan."* [The goal of this plan is to give more attention to the junior and senior years with the goals of creating more sophisticated and reflective learning opportunities in the upper class years, improving the sense of connection between those students and the institution, and providing more support to students for their transition from the physical campus.]

13. *Explore the desirability of Multicultural Student Services devoting more attention to the support of individual students and their overall success rather than the primary mission now of program and event delivery.*

14. *Participate in finding options for comprehensively addressing drug education.* [While there is a strategy in place for the handling of alcohol education, there is no equivalent strategy for other drugs and the alcohol approach cannot be used for other substances.]

Respectfully submitted,

Nick Kontogeorgopoulos
Chair, Student Life Committee, 2007-2008

Study Abroad Pre-Departure Survey

1. Part I

The Student Life Committee is seeking input from all students participating in study abroad programs in the coming year.

The purpose of this brief survey, and a post-arrival survey to be taken six or so months after arriving back in the United States, is to assess the impact of studying abroad on student engagement and learning outcomes.

This survey contains 30 questions, and should take no more than 10-15 minutes to complete.

1. In which country or countries will you be studying abroad?

Country

Country

Country

Country

Country

If more than 5 countries, please list additional countries in this box

2. What is the name of your study abroad program or programs (if more than one) (e.g., SIT, IES, etc.)?

Program

Program

Program

3. What is the language(s) of instruction in your program? Check all that apply.

- Chinese (Mandarin)
- English
- French
- German
- Greek
- Italian
- Japanese
- Portuguese
- Spanish
- Other (please specify)

Study Abroad Pre-Departure Survey

4. When do you plan on studying abroad? Check all that apply.

- Summer 2008

- Fall 2008

- Spring 2009

Study Abroad Pre-Departure Survey

2. Part II

5. At this point in your education, what do you anticipate will be your future career?

[   ]

6. What motivated you to want to study abroad in general? Check all that apply.

- A particular program
- To study in, or learn about, a particular country
- To assess career options
- To fulfill major/minor requirements
- Encouragement from (or recommendation of) my department
- Encouragement from (or recommendation of) an advisor
- Encouragement from (or recommendation of) a staff member
- Encouragement from (or recommendation of) a faculty member
- Encouragement from (or recommendation of) a peer
- Encouragement from (or recommendation of) a parent
- Language immersion
- To pursue internship opportunities
- To spend time away from UPS
- Other (please specify)

[   ]

7. When did you first start thinking about wanting to study abroad?

- Prior to first year
- First year
- Sophomore year
- Junior year
- Senior year

8. How important were the following when deciding on your choice of program?

	Extremely important	Somewhat important	Not very important	Not important at all
Cost	jn	jn	jn	jn
Reputation	jn	jn	jn	jn
Location (specific country)	jn	jn	jn	jn
Location (specific location within a country)	jn	jn	jn	jn
Course offerings associated with a particular program	jn	jn	jn	jn
Familiarity with host culture	jn	jn	jn	jn
Fulfills major/minor requirements	jn	jn	jn	jn
Transferability of financial aid	jn	jn	jn	jn
Presence of other American students	jn	jn	jn	jn
Absence of other American students	jn	jn	jn	jn
Language pre-requisites	jn	jn	jn	jn
Availability of advanced foreign language instruction	jn	jn	jn	jn

9. What kind of housing do you currently live in?

jn On-campus residence hall

jn On-campus theme house

jn On-campus house (not theme or residence hall)

jn Greek house

jn Off-campus house

jn Parent's house

jn Other (please specify)

10. How important will the following be to you while you are studying abroad?

	Extremely important	Somewhat important	Not very important	Not important at all
Friends going on the same program	jn	jn	jn	jn
Taking courses with other American students	jn	jn	jn	jn
Taking courses without other American students	jn	jn	jn	jn
Availability of internship opportunities	jn	jn	jn	jn
Home stay opportunities	jn	jn	jn	jn
Academic rigor	jn	jn	jn	jn
Travel opportunities	jn	jn	jn	jn
Cultural authenticity	jn	jn	jn	jn
Getting some time away from UPS	jn	jn	jn	jn
Having fun	jn	jn	jn	jn

Other (please specify)

11. If you had to guess, what impact do you think studying abroad will have on you personally?

	Definitely yes	Probably	Maybe	Probably not	Definitely not
Will help me to appreciate and understand my values	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Will enhance my ability to conduct independent research	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Will provide valuable memories	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Will help me develop skills for life beyond college	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Will enhance my knowledge of my major (s)	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Will demonstrate the value of my UPS education	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Will create a greater interest in international affairs	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Will enhance my appreciation of ethnic, racial, and class diversity	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn

12. How did you learn about study abroad opportunities? Check all that apply.

- ☞ From Office of International Programs (i.e., Study Abroad office)
- ☞ From faculty member
- ☞ From friend
- ☞ Other (please specify)

[   ]

13. Is there any information that you would have liked to receive but did not about studying abroad in general, or about your program in particular?

14. How well do you feel prepared for your study abroad experience, in the following areas?

	Extremely prepared	Somewhat prepared	Not very prepared	Extremely unprepared
Academically	◌	◌	◌	◌
Emotionally	◌	◌	◌	◌
Socially	◌	◌	◌	◌
Culturally	◌	◌	◌	◌
Financially	◌	◌	◌	◌
Linguistically	◌	◌	◌	◌

15. How many times have you traveled outside the 50 United States?

- ◌ 0
- ◌ 1
- ◌ 2
- ◌ 3
- ◌ 4
- ◌ 5
- ◌ More than 5

16. With whom have you traveled outside the 50 United States (on any of the trips)? Check all that apply.

- I have never traveled outside the 50 United States

- Alone

- Family members

- Friends

- School group

- Religious group (e.g., church)

- Other (please specify)

3. Part III

17. During the current school year, about how often have you done each of the following?

	Very often	Often	Sometimes	Never
Attended an art exhibit, gallery, play, dance, or other theater performance	j∩	j∩	j∩	j∩
Exercised or participated in physical fitness activities	j∩	j∩	j∩	j∩
Participated in activities to enhance your spirituality (worship, meditation, prayer, etc.)	j∩	j∩	j∩	j∩
Examined the strengths and weaknesses of your own views on a topic or issue	j∩	j∩	j∩	j∩
Tried to better understand someone else's views by imagining how an issue looks from his or her perspective	j∩	j∩	j∩	j∩
Learned something that changed the way you understand an issue or concept	j∩	j∩	j∩	j∩

18. About how many hours do you spend in a typical 7-day week doing each of the following?

Hours per week

Preparing for class (studying, reading, writing, doing homework or lab work, analyzing data, rehearsing, and other academic activities)	[▼]
Working for pay ON campus	[▼]
Working for pay OFF campus	[▼]
Participating in co-curricular activities (organizations, campus publications, student government, fraternity or sorority, intercollegiate or intramural sports, etc.)	[▼]
Relaxing and socializing (watching TV, partying, etc.)	[▼]
Providing care for dependents living with you (parents, children, spouse, etc.)	[▼]
Commuting to class (driving, walking, etc.)	[▼]

19. To what extent has your experience at UPS contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following areas?

	Very much	Quite a bit	Some	Very little
Acquiring a broad general education	jn	jn	jn	jn
Acquiring job or work-related knowledge and skills	jn	jn	jn	jn
Writing clearly and effectively	jn	jn	jn	jn
Speaking clearly and effectively	jn	jn	jn	jn
Analyzing quantitative problems	jn	jn	jn	jn
Working effectively with others	jn	jn	jn	jn
Understanding people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds	jn	jn	jn	jn
Developing a personal code of values and ethics	jn	jn	jn	jn
Contributing to the welfare of your community	jn	jn	jn	jn
Developing a deepened sense of spirituality	jn	jn	jn	jn
Gaining in-depth knowledge of a subject area	jn	jn	jn	jn
Reading or speaking a foreign language	jn	jn	jn	jn
Appreciating art, literature, music, drama	jn	jn	jn	jn
Developing awareness of social problems	jn	jn	jn	jn
Placing current problems in historical/cultural/philosophical perspective	jn	jn	jn	jn
Understanding moral and ethical issues	jn	jn	jn	jn
Understanding myself; abilities, interests, limitations, and personality	jn	jn	jn	jn
Conducting independent research, without supervision	jn	jn	jn	jn
Developing self-esteem	jn	jn	jn	jn
Gaining familiarity with a variety of academic fields	jn	jn	jn	jn
Understanding interrelationships among various fields of knowledge	jn	jn	jn	jn
Working under pressure	jn	jn	jn	jn

20. How satisfied are you with each of the following services or aspects of UPS?

	Very satisfied	Generally satisfied	Generally dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Not relevant
Student interaction with faculty	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Financial aid office	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Student voice in campus politics	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Social life on campus	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Cultural and fine arts programming	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Lectures and speakers	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Religious/spiritual life	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Ethnic/racial diversity	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Climate for minority students on campus	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Sense of community on campus	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Courses in major field	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Overall quality of instruction	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Size of classes	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Foreign language programs	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Opportunity for study abroad	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Responsiveness of administrative offices to student concerns	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn

21. If you could start over again, would you come to UPS?

jn Definitely yes

jn Probably yes

jn Probably no

jn Definitely no

Study Abroad Pre-Departure Survey

4. Part IV (Final Section)

22. In what year were you born?

23. What is your sex?

- ○ Male
- ○ Female
- ○ I prefer not to respond

24. What is your racial or ethnic identification? Check all that apply.

- ○ American Indian or other Native American
- ○ Asian, Asian American, or Pacific Islander
- ○ Black or African American
- ○ White (non-Hispanic)
- ○ Mexican or Mexican American
- ○ Puerto Rican
- ○ Other Hispanic or Latino
- ○ I prefer not to respond
- ○ Other (please specify)

25. What is your current classification in college?

- ○ Freshman/first-year
- ○ Sophomore
- ○ Junior
- ○ Senior
- ○ Unclassified

26. Did you begin college at UPS or elsewhere?

- ○ Started at UPS
- ○ Started elsewhere

27. Are you a member of a fraternity or sorority?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No

28. Are you a student-athlete on a team sponsored by the UPS Athletics Department?

- ◌ Yes

- ◌ No

If Yes, on what team(s) are you an athlete (e.g., football, swimming)?

[   ]

29. What have most of your grades been up to now at UPS?

- ◌ A

- ◌ A-

- ◌ B+

- ◌ B

- ◌ B-

- ◌ C+

- ◌ C

- ◌ C- or lower

30. Please list your intended undergraduate major(s) and minor(s)/interdisciplinary emphasis. Check all that apply.

	Major	Minor or Interdisciplinary Emphasis
African American Studies	◌	◌
Art	◌	◌
Asian Studies	◌	◌
Biochemistry and Molecular Biology	◌	◌
Biology	◌	◌
Business and Leadership	◌	◌
Chemistry	◌	◌
Classics	◌	◌
Communication Studies	◌	◌
Comparative Sociology	◌	◌
Computer Science	◌	◌
Dual Degree Engineering	◌	◌
Economics	◌	◌
English	◌	◌
Environmental Studies	◌	◌
Exercise Science	◌	◌
Foreign Languages and International Affairs	◌	◌
Foreign Languages and Literature	◌	◌

Gender Studies	jn	jn
Geology	jn	jn
Global Development Studies	jn	jn
History	jn	jn
Honors	jn	jn
Humanities	jn	jn
International Political Economy	jn	jn
Latin American Studies	jn	jn
Mathematics	jn	jn
School of Music	jn	jn
Natural Science	jn	jn
Neuroscience	jn	jn
Philosophy	jn	jn
Physics	jn	jn
Politics and Government	jn	jn
Psychology	jn	jn
Religion	jn	jn
Science, Technology, and Society	jn	jn
Special Interdisciplinary Major	jn	jn
Theatre Arts	jn	jn

Other (please specify)

Friday, April 25, 2008

Doug Cannon
Chair, Faculty Senate
University of Puget Sound

Committee Report - LMIS (2007-2008)

As required by Faculty By-Laws here is an end of the year report from the Library, Media, Information Services Committee for the academic year Fall 2007 through Spring 2008.

During the 2007-2208 academic year the Library, Media, and Information Systems (LMIS) committee addressed the specific charges given to us by the faculty senate as well as several additional topics. These are listed below with a short commentary on the state of those charges. Committee members were: Patrick O'Neill, David Tinsley, Zaixin Hong, Ariela Tubert, Andrew Nierman, Dan Sherman, Katherine Smith, Mott Greene, Yvonne Smith and William Dasher.

As per faculty senate charges OIS representatives (Randy Thornton, Theresa Duhart and, later, Molly Tamarkin) and Library representatives (Lori Ricigliano and Peggy Firman) met regularly with LMIS to apprise us of new plans and changes. This was very helpful and greatly aided discussion. Dean Alyce Demarais was also in attendance and provided invaluable insights on several issues as well as providing suggestions on procedural matters.

Learning Management systems (LMS): LMIS was charged with looking into our LMS by Michael Nanfito (then director of IT) in the Spring of 2005. After two years of discussion and testing we submitted a summary of our findings, requesting that we move to Moodle, to the Faculty Senate. The Senate approved our recommendation on March 24, 2008.

CTO and Library director Search: The committee interviewed all of the candidates for the two positions and provided feedback to the Search committee. We also spoke with Narnee Viner and Michelle Bonoan from Gary Kaplan and Associates (search firm) discussing our view of the position and type of candidate we felt best suited to UPS. In addition several members of LMIS were involved with the process in greater detail. With the hiring of Molly Tamarkin (CTO) and Jane Carlin (LD) we have discharged those obligations.

Spam: In late September, 2007, the senate charged LMIS with looking into the issue of spam. This was prompted by a number of complaints from faculty after a flurry of spam showed up on campus computers. We responded to the Senate by letter on October 8, 2007. In essence the school can adjust the spam filter to different levels of rejection. OIS moved that level down which, to a large degree, alleviated the problem with the caveat that users should check their reject files to insure that desired emails were coming through.

Library Subscriptions: This is an ongoing issue as the library is moving from print to electronic subscriptions. LMIS is updated on that periodically but it is apparent that the issue of cost and availability is a moving window. Thus, there is no established policy on how to fast and to what degree we can move to electronic media. Also, appropriately, any decisions the library makes on subscriptions is vetted by the concerned department. There are no new issues regarding the process of evaluating and implementing library subscriptions.

Intellectual Property: LMIS is charged to establish a policy on intellectual property and present this to the faculty. We have established that intellectual property created, made, or originated by a faculty member shall be the sole and exclusive property of the faculty, author, or inventor, except as he or she may voluntarily choose to transfer such property, in full, or in part. Beyond that, the committee is still engaging in discussion on a number of details. For example, how do we treat student papers and the related issue of access and availability of archived material. We are currently discussing exceptions and stipulations most likely to arise from anticipated scenarios.

Copyright Policy: This is a related issue to intellectual property. First, we have looked at the Teach Act requirement that the university has a statement establishing fair use. We are near to providing this policy statement. We also continue working on how to deal with specific issues with a goal of creating a more complete document including a complimentary FAQ covering situations. With the recent hiring of a Library Director the committee is nearing the completion of this charge and will continue their work.

Digital Assets: Although not a charge from the Senate the role of digital assets is intertwined with the issue of intellectual property and copyright policy. As a result LMIS has spent time on discussing digital assets and should continue this discussion next year with the goal of establishing a policy and mechanism for dealing with digital assets. Again, with the hiring of our new LD we feel we can make significant progress on this issue next year. A related matter is how do we popularize and educate the campus on the role of digital assets, our capabilities for handling digital assets and a how-to FAQ. This discussion involves both the library director and head of OIS.

Back-up of faculty Computers: Theresa Duhart from OIS is working on this and is developing procedures and documentation for backing up PCs and Macs. This may involve looking at several levels of backup including localized backup systems and backing up to campus servers.

Additional Issues

Point of purchase: LMIS briefly discussed the concept of point of purchase. For example having students have an account that starts with 500 pages of free copying per term (say) and then they are charged beyond that allocation.   This might be a way to encourage sustainability and move certain costs to users. This could be handled by software linked to the users computer sign-in. This topic was broached as a possible subject for further discussion and no recommendations are made.

Introduction of new technologies: LMIS is interested in encouraging a process by which new technologies could be introduced, and funded, to the campus in such a way as to allow evaluation without undue financial impact. Those technologies that prove useful can then be expanded and funded accordingly. A technology-teaching sandbox room is one idea. Another is to provide a fund for early users to explore new tools and then reporting on their experience to the appropriate body.

Hiring of Director of Instructional Technology: This will be an agenda item for next year as OIS moves to hire a director of instructional technology. We recommend that the IT director position be a faculty appointment.

Personal Response System: Several members of LMIS were enthusiastic about using a personal response system, or classroom clicker. Others were less enthusiastic but willing to give it a try. We recommend that OIS provide selected Instructors with this technology and follow their experience with an eye towards expanding the program should it prove effective and popular.

Recommended charges for next years LMIS.

Several of our charges from the Senate are on-going and will need to be continued.

1. Digital Assets
2. Copyright policy
3. Intellectual property

respectively submitted to the Senate on this day, April 25, 2008,

William Dasher, chair LMIS
Department of Chemistry
University of Puget Sound

Ongoing charges for 2008-2009 for Library, Media, and Information Systems Committee (provided by Alyce DeMarais):

1. Meet with OIS and Library representatives at the beginning of each term to learn about upcoming decisions and changes relevant to LMIS.

2. Continue discussion regarding multiple-format journal subscriptions.

3. Continue implementing a copyright policy (in support of the TEACH act).

4. Continue discussion of faculty intellectual property.

5. Assist OIS with the implementation of Moodle as our Learning Management System.

Faculty Committee on Diversity

2007-2008 Annual Report to the Faculty Senate

Introduction

The Diversity Committee engaged in a wide variety of projects and discussions during the 2007-2008 academic year. Because issues of diversity cut across the University community, the Committee boasts one of the largest memberships of any faculty committee and includes a number of students and staff members, although student participation was limited this academic year. This report begins by listing the Committee's membership before giving a brief general history of the committee's work. The history is followed by a review of the Committee's charges and recommended charges for next year.

Committee Membership

The membership of the 2007-2008 Diversity Committee (in alphabetical order) consisted of: Heather Ahuero (Fall 2007- student); Skylar Bihl (Fall 2007- student); Kim Bobby (Chief Diversity Officer and School of Education); Heather Clifford (Dining and Conference Services); Monica DeHart (Comparative Sociology); Lisa Ferrari (Spring 2008, representing Dean Kris Bartanen); Marcos Goldstein (Fall 2007- student); Judith Kay (Religion); Carol Lentz (Academic Advising); Janet Marcavage (Fall 2007- Art); Yoshiko Matsui (Associate Director for Student Services); Paula Meiers (representing George Mills, Admission); Nancy Nieraeth (Human Resources); Margi Nowak (Comparative Sociology); Mike Valentine (Geology) co-chair; Carrie Washburn (Fall 2007, representing Dean Kris Bartanen); Nila Wiese (Business and Leadership) co-chair.

The committee received seven charges from the Faculty Senate at the start of 2007-2008. These charges, shown in italics below, were specific, gave the Committee direction, and helped guide the year's activities. The charges all relate to the task of helping the University community become more welcoming to a diverse variety of students, staff, and faculty. The Committee received a small budget to support activities related to the work of the Committee. In addition to the charges from the Faculty Senate, and partly in response to the charges, the Committee undertook an examination of its role and effectiveness that took up much of the year.

Review of Charges for 2007-2008

1. *Continue working with the Office of Admission, the Office of Human Resources, and other appropriate offices and governing bodies on support of efforts to recruit and retain an increasingly talented and diverse faculty, staff, and student body.*

The 2006-2007 Diversity Committee submitted an end-of-year report to the Faculty Senate last year regarding issues of recruiting and retaining a diverse student body, and this year's committee followed up with discussions of the report with the Faculty Senate in Fall 2007. Several committee members spent considerable time and effort producing last year's report, and we felt that more should come out of it. The lack of an adequate venue for action that could be taken on concerns raised by the report was part of the impetus for discussions of the real role of the Diversity Committee that follows below.

2. *Continue a program of national participation by sending delegates to gather information at one of the several conferences devoted to diversity issues in higher education.*

The Committee used its limited funds to help support eight Black Student Union members attend the National Black Student union Conference in Chicago.

3. *Provide liaison between the faculty, staff, and student organizations related to diversity issues and continue working with the Student Diversity Center and the Office of Multicultural Student Services to support the work of Student Diversity Center organizations, Diversity Theme Year, and other existing and emerging organizations and programs.*

All functioning student organizations were assigned liaisons from the Diversity Committee. These liaisons occasionally attended meetings of diversity groups in an effort to improve communication and provide support when necessary. Some student groups appreciate and make some use of liaisons, while most simply acknowledge our effort.

4. *Work with the appropriate University groups to promote language in University documents that encourages and rewards greater faculty involvement in creating and maintaining a welcoming and accepting climate for diverse students, faculty, and staff.*

This charge was tabled this year pending revision of committee by-laws (see below).

5. *Support the Chief Diversity Officer in developing and implementing the Strategic Diversity plan for the Puget Sound Campus.*

The committee offered its assistance to Kim Bobby, Chief Diversity Officer. Kim is still defining her role as Chief Diversity Officer, and the main assistance rendered by the Committee this year was in the development of the Moment-Us event planned for next fall. This will be a campus-wide event held in conjunction with LOGJAM, and designed to explore and examine our commitment to diversity on the Puget Sound campus. The tag line for the event: "MOMENT-US- COMPASSIONATE CAMPUS: EXPLORING AND EMBRACING OUR DIVERSITY ". In addition, the Committee is assisting with the roll-out of the Diversity Strategic Plan.

6. *In collaboration with the Chief Diversity Officer and the Dean of Students, constitute the Bias and Hate Education Response Team (BHERT) and forward recommendations regarding its institutional home and the annual process for constituting its membership.*

The Committee worked with Kim Bobby and Vice President Mike Segawa to constitute the renamed Bias-hate Education Response Team (BERT) and solicit suggestions for the BERT logo. The rest of the Diversity Committee budget, that was not used to support BSU conference participation, was allocated to supporting the launching of BERT, specifically funding of the BERT logo contest. Co-chairs of the Diversity Committee (Wiese and Valentine) and two other members (DeHart and Nieraeth) agreed to serve as members of BERT. A framework was established that serves to reestablish BERT on an annual basis. The Diversity Committee will continue to work with BERT to refine its protocols so that the BERT response process is transparent to the campus community.

7. *Consult with the Race and Pedagogy Initiative Task Force regarding its suggestions on the diversity work of the campus, including diversity training and advance planning of major diversity events.*

The Senate rescinded this charge.

Most of the Diversity Committee's time and energies during 2007-2008 were spent in reflection on the committee's role at the University and its lack of "teeth". Although committee members over the past several years have worked long and hard, fruits of these labors often seem relatively minimal. Many current and former members of the Committee have been frustrated by the lack of progress. In addition, although we are a "faculty" committee, reporting to the Faculty Senate, we are constituted of not just faculty, but also of staff members and students. This composition has confused our role and mission. As a faculty committee, should we address only issues related to faculty? What then are the roles of non-faculty members of the Committee? Staff and students have

expressed some sense of exclusion form the work of the Committee in many cases. For instance, the Committee saw the addition of language affirming the value of diversity related activities to the "buff document" (summary of evaluation criteria for faculty) as one of our biggest accomplishments of the past several years. This issue applied mainly to the faculty, although the effects may reach beyond the faculty. Non-faculty members agreed that it was a significant accomplishment, but felt little investment in the process. As a result of these problems, the Diversity Committee took it upon itself, with the blessing of the Faculty and Staff Senates, to revise our by-laws to better define the mission and authority of the Committee.

The Committee recommends splitting the current Diversity Committee into two separate committees and creating new by-laws for each group. The two committees, Faculty and Staff, will each send representatives to a Diversity Advisory Council that will serve as a consulting body to the Chief Diversity Officer. ASUPS will also appoint members to the Council. The Council will coordinate diversity initiatives coming from the three separate groups. Further details of these by-law changes will be forwarded to the Faculty Senate.

Finally, the Faculty Senate charged the Diversity Committee late in the spring with developing a plan for faculty diversity training. Brainstorming among committee members and discussions with Senators, the Coalition Against Injustice and Racism (CAIR), and Academic Advising led the Committee to suggest that the diversity training be included as a formal part of academic advisor training every August. Over several cycles of advisor training, this program would reach a majority of faculty members. It is too late to make diversity training a significant component of this year's advisor training program, but we hope to introduce the idea this September and follow it up with a more extensive program in succeeding years.

Proposed Charges for 2008-2009

1. *Continue working with the Faculty Senate to reconstitute the Faculty Diversity Committee, revising the bylaws for this committee and facilitating approval of such changes in a timely fashion.*

2. *Continue to develop and implement a program for faculty diversity training.*

3. *Examine the language of the University's Diversity Statement in light of suggested changes from the Coalition Against Injustice and Racism.*

We believe these to be the most pressing issues facing the Diversity Committee for next year. More detailed formal charges should come out of the discussions of by-law revision. Several of these charges will undoubtedly be similar to charges from the Senate over the past several years. Suggested duties under new by-laws include the following:

1. Actively participate in the development of initiatives that enable the university to hire new faculty from under-represented populations, and that better support the retention and success of such faculty.

2. Work with the President, Vice-Presidents, and the Chief Diversity Officer in diversity initiatives that relate to and/or require faculty presence and leadership as needed.

3. Establish liaisons with key university units, as needed, in order to assess strategic needs and work collaboratively in diversity-related initiatives.

4. Report annually to the Faculty the University's efforts and results achieved in the following areas:

   a. Recruitment and retention of faculty members from underrepresented groups.
   b. Progress of those departments completing their five-year reviews toward diversity-related objectives.
   c. Campus utilization of the Bias-Hate Educational Response Team (BERT).

   Such reports shall be presented and published as the Committee deems appropriate.

5. Work with colleagues to enrich the classroom climate so that all students and faculty, regardless of their personal, ethnic, racial, or class backgrounds, may be valued accordingly.

6. Activate the Bias-Hate Education Response Team annually, and collaborate with it as needed.

7. In collaboration with the Chief Diversity Officer work with various academic/non-academic units campus-wide on regular fall opening semester program focused on the university's core value of diversity.

8. Serve as liaisons to student diversity groups.

9. Appoint three members to serve on the Diversity Advisory Council.

10. Such other duties as may be assigned to it.

Restructuring of the University's Committee on Diversity
Proposal presented to the Faculty Senate
April 25, 2008

This document summarizes the Committee on Diversity's proposal for re-structuring the current diversity committee. We propose:

1. That the Faculty Senate's standing Committee on Diversity be reconfigured in terms of membership and duties.

2. That a new Diversity Committee under the Staff Senate be created and duties assigned to it. We have, in consultation with the Faculty Senate and the Staff Senate, prepared a list of tentative duties. The Staff Senate should proceed with the discussion and creation of this committee on diversity as they deem appropriate.

3. That a Diversity Advisory Council be created to directly collaborate with the Chief Diversity Officer in the implementation of the University's Diversity Strategic Plan and in coordinating diversity initiatives across campus. Membership and duties are proposed below.

Faculty Senate's Standing Committee on Diversity

The Committee shall consist of Dean of the University or designee (ex-officio); the Chief Diversity Officer (ex-officio); and no fewer than seven appointed faculty members.

The duties of the Committee shall be to:

1. Actively participate in the development of initiatives that enable the university to hire new faculty from under-represented populations, and that better support the retention and success of such faculty.

2. Work with the President, Vice-Presidents, and the Chief Diversity Officer in diversity initiatives that relate to and/or require faculty presence and leadership as needed.

3. Establish liaisons with key university units, as needed, in order to assess strategic needs and work collaboratively in diversity-related initiatives.

4. Report annually to the Faculty the University's efforts and results achieved in the following areas:

   a. Recruitment and retention of faculty members from underrepresented groups.
   b. Progress of those departments completing their five-year reviews toward diversity-related objectives.
   c. Campus utilization of the Bias-Hate Educational Response Team (BERT).

Such reports shall be presented and published as the Committee deems appropriate.

5. Work with colleagues to enrich the classroom climate so that all students and faculty, regardless of their personal, ethnic, racial, or class backgrounds, may be valued accordingly.

6. Activate the Bias-Hate Education Response Team annually, and collaborate with it as needed.

7. In collaboration with the Chief Diversity Officer work with various academic/non-academic units campus-wide on regular fall opening semester program focused on the university's core value of diversity.

8. Serve as liaisons to student diversity groups.

9. Recommend members to serve on the Diversity Advisory Council.

10. Such other duties as may be assigned to it.

Staff Senate's Standing Committee on Diversity

The Committee shall consist of the Associate Vice President for Human Resources (ex-officio); the Chief Diversity Officer (ex-officio); and no fewer than five appointed staff members.

The duties of the Committee shall be to:

1. Assist the President, the Vice Presidents, and the Chief Diversity Officer in diversity initiatives that relate to and/or require staff presence and leadership, as needed.

2. Actively participate in the development of initiatives that enable the university to hire staff from under-represented populations, and that better support the retention and success of such staff.

3. Report annually to the Staff Senate the University's efforts and results achieved in recruiting and retaining staff members from under-represented groups. The report shall be presented and published as the Committee deems appropriate.

4. Work with colleagues to enrich the work climate so that all staff and administrators, regardless of their personal, ethnic, racial, or class backgrounds, may be valued accordingly.

5. Appoint staff to the Bias-Hate Education Response Team.

6. Recommend members to serve on the Diversity Advisory Council, one of whom should be the Associate Vice President for Human Resources or its designee.

7. Such other duties as may be assigned to it.

Diversity Advisory Council

Diversity Advisory Council will be comprised of members from various campus centers. One representative from the Faculty Diversity Committee, the Staff Senate, Admission, Multicultural Student Services, Access Programs, Race & Pedagogy, Spirituality, Service and Social Justice; two representatives from ASUPS; and two members-at-large. Appointments will be made by the President in consultation with Vice Presidents and the Chief Diversity Officer. Nominations put forth by the Faculty Senate, the Staff Senate, and ASUPS will inform the process.

Each Diversity Advisory Council member will serve on a task force steering committee. The steering committees will represent various task forces in alignment with the goals of the Diversity Strategic Plan. Steering committee members for each task force will be appointed by the Chief Diversity Officer and/or a Vice-President. They will include faculty, staff and students. The steering committees will engage others who want to serve in targeted ways.

The duties of the Diversity Advisory Council will be in alignment with the university Diversity Strategic Plan goals, and include:
(Please note that these are still being shaped by the conversation on diversity being led by Pres. Thomas and Kim Bobby-Chief Diversity Officer.)

1. Direct and coordinate the planning and implementation of the University's Diversity Strategic Plan.

2. Provide leadership on diversity related initiatives across campus, ensuring that these initiatives are aligned with the University's values and goals.

3. Assess progress made by academic and non-academic units in the achievement of diversity-related goals and provide feedback for further improvements.

4. Form and help coordinate the work of steering committees in the areas of: Recruitment and Retention, Curriculum Development and Faculty Advising, Campus Climate, Diversity Outreach, Diversity Communication.

5. Report to the University community progress made in the achievement of diversity-related goals.

6. Such other duties as may be assigned to it.

Institutional Review Board
Report to the Faculty Senate
AY 2007-2008

The Institutional Review Board (IRB) exists for the purpose of protecting the rights, health, and well-being of human beings solicited and volunteering for participation as research subjects. In the context of reviewing proposed research studies involving human subjects the IRB gives very careful attention to issues such as potential risks to participants, protection of participants' identities and disclosed information of a sensitive nature, safety, ethical recruitment practices, and the accessibility and adequacy of informed consent. This is a report the the University of Puget Sound Faculty Senate regarding activities of the IRB during the 2007-2008 academic year.

The Senate charges presented by Professor Richard Anderson-Connolly to the 2007-2008 Institutional Review Board were as follows:

1. Continue to monitor protocols and maintain and manage records for research involving human subjects.

2. Post and monitor upgraded IRB information on the webpage for UPS researchers.

3. Work with the new Associate Dean and IRB liaison with the administration and discuss administrative duties for the IRB liaison that ease the secretarial work of the Chair.

4. Determine the possibility of an electronic IRB stamp for approved consent/assent forms.

5. Explore the possibility to create web-space where IRB approved UPS research studies can post flyers for recruitment of human subjects.

6. Consider the scope and mechanism of IRB review in light of national professional and disciplinary standards.

The following describes actions taken by the IRB over the course of the 2007-2008 academic year regarding each of the six charges from the Senate:

1. Continue to monitor protocols and maintain and manage records for research involving human subjects.

As charged, the IRB maintained its primary role by monitoring protocols and maintaining and managing records for research involving human subjects. Specifically, a total of 175 research protocols were reviewed by Departmental IRB Designates this year. Of those, 158 were approved for either "exempt" or "expedited" status – meaning that the

study procedures, level of risk, sampling methods, or nature of participant population did not meet criteria necessary for a full Board review. Seventeen protocols were reviewed by the full Board and 15 of those received approval.

2. Post and monitor upgraded IRB information on the webpage for UPS researchers.

Based on modifications and updates to IRB operating and submission guidelines developed during AY 2006-7, the IRB webpage was updated this year. The current guidelines may be found at http://www2.ups.edu/dean/irb/index.shtml.

3. Work with the new Associate Dean and IRB liaison with the administration and discuss administrative duties for the IRB liaison that ease the secretarial work of the Chair.

Beginning in September 2007 the new Associate Dean, Professor Sarah Moore, joined the IRB. This year's IRB chair, Professor Roger Allen, worked together with Dean Moore to clarify IRB operating procedures and review protocol intake, tracking, and follow-up monitoring. A division of work between the IRB chair and clerical support from the Associate Dean's office was determined that appropriately reflected who should be involved in each task and phase of protocol processing. While the workload of the IRB chair remains substantial, it is quite reasonable in the context of requirements for faculty participation in University governance and service.

In the spring semester, Professor Lisa Ferrari replaced Sarah Moore as administrative representative and oversight officer for the IRB. She has since participated in all Board activities and worked closely with the IRB chair on emerging issues related to the IRB.

4. Determine the possibility of an electronic IRB stamp for approved consent/assent forms.

This possibility is still being explored and linked to an ongoing discussion of the feasibility of moving to all electronic protocol submission. It was determined by the Board that a few barriers still remain to implementation of electronic submission and approval. Possible solutions to the specific barriers are being explored.

5. Explore the possibility to create web-space where IRB approved UPS research studies can post flyers for recruitment of human subjects.

The idea of creating a web-space for posting recruitment flyers for approved research studies was explored. It was the consensus of the Board that the specific participant recruitment requirements for most approved studies would not be served by a consolidated recruitment web-site. In other words, such a sight is unlikely to be the place

potential qualifying volunteers would look to become involved as a research subject. Considered from another angle, it is rare that a potential participant goes out looking for a study to participate in, rather it is the investigator that reaches out to potential participants who qualify in consideration of study-specific inclusion and exclusion criteria. While this issue is not currently under further consideration, discussion may be reopened if a more focused proposal is offered.

6. Consider the scope and mechanism of IRB review in light of national professional and disciplinary standards.

At the October 11, 2007, meeting of the IRB, Professor Ray Preiss distributed a document from the Center for Advanced Study entitled "Improving the System for Protecting Human Subjects: Counteracting IRB "Mission Creep". He reported that he learned of the existence of this document from Suzanne Holland who was the Senator who originally brought the issue to the attention of the Faculty Senate. Professor Preiss pointed out that this document is a white paper "conversation" and does not reflect policy changes that are federally mandated. The group involved in preparing this document consisted of ethicists and others with an interest in social science research rather than individuals who have actual responsibility for monitoring the protection of human subjects. Professor Preiss reported that he searched for documents in the human subjects protection literature related to streamlining the review process. He found no records related to limiting IRB review as a way to improve efficiency. Also, there was no evidence of any changes in required federal assurances or mandates. The assertion raised in the Senate the IRB oversight is only required for federally funded projects is false.

The IRB also wishes Senators to be aware that Department Designates review all protocols prior to full Board review to determine those qualifying for exempt or expedited status. Of 175 protocols reviewed this year, 158 were designated for exempt or expedited status by Departmental Designates, whereas 17 met criteria for full board oversight and were forwarded to the campus-wide IRB for review. Interested Senators may find criteria for "exempt," "expedited," and "full board review" status fully articulated at the IRB website, http://www2.ups.edu/dean/irb/index.shtml. Perhaps understanding of this two-tiered review process may help alleviate some of the concerns expressed the initial dialog in the Senate.

The Board suggests that Senators who are interested in understanding more about the federal regulations and IRB oversight visit the IRB training website provided by NIH http://cme.cancer.gov/clinicaltrials/learning/humanparticipant-protections.asp.

Additional Issues Considered by the IRB AY 2007-2008:

It was observed that over four days during the fall semester of 2007 Charles River Clinical Services (CRCS) staffed a table in the Student Union Building for the purpose of recruiting students to become part of a database for potential participants in Phase I pharmaceutical trials.

[As background, FDA approval of pharmaceuticals requires that medications be established as both safe and effective. Phase I trials for potential new pharmaceuticals are conducted on healthy volunteers who do not manifest the pathology that the drug is designed to treat. That means Phase I trials are not testing efficacy, but rather the safety of the drug. In other words, these are toxicity trials to determine for the first time what toxic or harmful effects the drug may have on humans.]

CRCS had obtained permission to set up a vendor's table in the SUB and paid a nominal daily fee to be recruiting on-campus. However, they did not submit research protocols or obtain campus IRB approval to recruit human volunteers for specific drug trials. The IRB chair discussed the matter with the subject recruitment representative for CRCS. CRCS refused to submit protocols of specific studies to the UPS IRB, citing proprietary information regarding drug development and approval on a study-by-study basis by "Aspire," an external contract IRB firm. CRCS was sent a letter from the IRB chair to suspend all solicitation and research participant recruitment at UPS or of UPS students or staff.

On April 24, 2007, Kris Bartanen, Lisa Ferrari, and Roger Allen participated in a conference call with Thomas Jeffries, an attorney with IRB expertise, regarding IRB authority over solicitation of UPS students and staff by outside research entities and to develop greater understanding of the University's role in protecting the safety, well-being, and rights of UPS students and personnel in the context of potential research participation with outside entities. As a result, policies for screening potential vendors are being reviewed and revised. Additionally, methods to educate the University's student and staff populations regarding research participation, the nature of Phase I pharmaceutical trials, and rights as research subjects are being explored.

As an additional item, the IRB is exploring obtaining "Federalwide Assurance" which will register the UPS IRB with the Office of Human Research Protection. This will give the on-campus IRB authority to review and oversee any federally funded research studies being conducted on campus, or by University faculty.

By way of final word, federal guidelines require that the IRB have an outside member, not employed by the University, serve on the Board. The IRB could not function without the conscientious participation of our "community representatives." We have been most fortunate to have sincerely dedicated community reps serve in the past, completely without compensation. During the past two years, Marsha Gallacher has served as our community representative. Marsha has put in many hours, contributed a great deal of insight, and added valued perspective to all IRB activities, discussions, and deliberations this year.

I wish to respectfully request that we forward to Marsha Gallacher a formal vote of thanks from both the University and the Faculty Senate for her contributions to protecting the safety of research participants and for enhancing the quality and scope of the exchange of ideas regarding human research on this campus.

Charges for the 2008-2009 IRB committee:

1. Continue to review protocols and maintain and manage records for research involving human subjects.
2. Post and monitor upgraded IRB information on the webpage for UPS researchers.
3. Explore "Federalwide Assurance" registration for the University IRB.

Respectfully Submitted,
Roger Allen, PhD, PT
IRB Chair AY 2007-8

To: Faculty Senate, UPS
From: Dave Balaam, Chair ISAC
Re: Committee Report for 2007-08

Dear Faculty Senate,
The International Study Abroad Committee met on a biweekly basis for most of the
school year. As charged by the Faculty Senate in the fall, we pursued the following
objectives.

1. Review, revise and/or reaffirm the 2003 Mission Statement for study abroad.
2. Advance the recommendation that the Interim Study Abroad Committee become a
standing committee name the International Education Committee.
3. Consider the recommendations of the Study Abroad Working Group (SAWG) and
coordinate policy recommendations with SAWG.
4. Consider the financial consequences of structural changes to the study abroad program
and discuss additional funding sources for both the study abroad program and scholarship
funds to help students meet the extra costs of study abroad.
5. Review existing study abroad programs.

Summation of ISAC work.

1. The committee began its work in September revising the 2003 mission statement. The
committee agreed that the new mission statement should read:

2007: UPS Study Abroad Mission Statement (10/30/07) (**draft**)

> *The University of Puget Sound believes that, as part of its commitment to a liberal
> undergraduate education, it should make available to its students a sound program
> for study abroad. The value of a study abroad program lies in the exposure of Puget
> Sound students to cultural patterns and values different from their own in conjunction
> with opportunities to enrich academic study in other countries. Puget Sound students
> participating in a study abroad program will also develop their understanding of the
> complexity and diversity of the world as they enhance their knowledge in selected
> academic fields.*

Specific goals (not in priority order):

> 1. *Offer students varied and geographically diverse programs so as to meet the
>   academic interests the student population.*
> 2. *Each study abroad program will be compatible with the university's education
>   goals and will meet its academic standards.*
> 3. *Study abroad programs should have well developed curriculi with classes taught
>   by faculty recognized for their background and expertise in the subjects they
>   teach.*

4. Programs should encourage significant contact with society and culture outside the classroom that enriches each student's experience in another country.

The University of Puget Sound will approve which study abroad programs will be added to the list of programs approved for transfer of credit. These programs will be routinely evaluated by the university in manner set forth by the university.

2. On Monday, April 22, the University Faculty Approved the formation of a permanent International Education Committee to replace the ISAC. The language of the measure passed is under:

Article V. Section 6.J. The International Education Committee:
- a. The Committee shall consist of the Dean of the University (ex-officio), the Dean of Students (ex-officio, the Director of International Programs (ex-officio), no fewer that seven appointed members of the Faculty, and two students.
- b. The duties of the Committee shall be to:
    1. Establish criteria and assessment procedures for international education programs.
    2. Review and approve new and existing international education programs and program proposals, including programs led by University faculty.
    3. Assist the Office of International Programs in selecting students for study abroad.
    4. Represent the interests of the Faculty in international education.
    5. Such other duties as may be assigned to it.

3. Throughout the year the ISAC has routinely read and considered the recommendations of the administration's Study Abroad Working Group (SAWG). SAWG documents are composed of a series of descriptive observations about UPS study abroad programs: namely types, availability, application deadlines, fee structures, and comparisons with the programs of other institutions. The SWAG also put forth a series of recommendations related to (see Study Abroad Working Group Report for ISAC 9/11/07):

- a. review and reduction of the number of UPS programs and eliminating redundant program,
- b. balancing fall with spring programs,
- c. implementing deadlines for applications for programs,
- d. implementing a GPA requirement for all study abroad programs
- e. limiting student participation to one study abroad program (excluding summer) to either one semester or one full year program.
- f. changing the pricing model for summer programs to the program cost plus an administrative fee.
- g. changing program designation to one type with a single price structure.

Related to these objectives:

a. ISAC is currently reviewing programs. See section 4
b. Jannie Meisberger is working on developing enrollment options to achieve this balance of participation in study abroad programs
c. In process
d. ISAC voted to impose a 3.0 GPA requirement, but to allow students to petition in the case of program providers with GPA requirements less than 3.0.
e. In process
f. Approved by President's Cabinet effective summer 2008
g. ISAC recommends that all programs be designated as "Partner" programs.

4. To accomplish the fourth objective the ISAC felt that it was at a minimum necessary to know which programs would be included in the list of Partner UPS programs (see below for a more detailed discussion of progress made on this objective).

However, two important developments occurred over the year related to the issue of financial support for UPS study abroad programs.

1. When pressed by the ISAC chair David Balaam, Dean Alyce Demarais stated that the cost of all UPS programs was not the only basis upon which the university would decide to keep or support each program. Chair Balaam noted that the dean's assertion seemed to be in conflict with the SWAG suggestion that *for financial reasons* the number of UPS programs needed to be cut.

2. ISAC Chair Balaam met with President Thomas in his office on Feb 16, 2008 for approximately one half hour. President Thomas understood why the ISAC was conflicted about SWAG pressure to reduce the number of programs while some faculty wanted to add new programs that were more in keeping with their academic interests. President Thomas responded that it was his intention to see the number of redundant or weak programs cut, while also supporting the suggestion that UPS needed to update its program offerings, especially in Africa and the Middle-East. President Thomas and Dave then discussed ways the university would acquire more funds for UPS programs in the future, including making overseas study programs another category for the new fund drive and donor support. The president and chair agreed to explore these and other ideas on another occasion.

5. The ISAC spent much of its time in the fall and early spring working on a set of criteria to evaluate all of the UPS programs. After much deliberation, it established the following criteria as measures to evaluate UPS programs:

These criteria are designed for evaluating individual programs. Programs offered by the University of Puget Sound must meet two overarching criteria. (Please note that a separate set of criteria is used for the evaluation of program providers.)

A. First, the University is committed to offering a set of geographically diverse programs to our students. The approval of new programs, as well as the approval of existing programs, should directly correlate with the mission of broadly expanding the geographical and cultural diversity of the constellation of approved programs offered by the University of Puget Sound.

B. Second, the University is committed to offering a set of programs that serve all students and disciplines on the campus. The approval of new programs, as well as the approval of existing programs, should directly correlate with expanding the University's offerings to underserved disciplines.

These are the core criteria by which the committee will evaluate both the addition of new programs and the ongoing approval of existing programs. ISAC recognizes that programs may fall more squarely in the ambit of one or the other of these criteria (in other words, a new program may contribute significantly to the extension of the disciplinary diversity of our offerings while not significantly expanding our geographical offerings). It is the task of the evaluators to nonetheless use these criteria to gauge the merit of the addition or maintenance of particular programs.

If a program is judged to meet this basic threshold, the committee must then evaluate the program using the five criteria below. The Committee is expected to use student evaluations, faculty evaluations, and all other information gathered by International Programs in the evaluation process.

A. Programs added or retained should offer our students a reasonably safe and secure environment in which to study and live.

B. Programs added or retained should not negatively impact the potential enrollment in those programs to which UPS maintains a significant affiliation or commitment (ILACA, Oaxaca, PAC-RIM, and so forth).

C. Programs added or retained should provide students with the opportunity for significant contact with the culture and people of the host country, particularly when this contact is directly tied to the stated mission of the program.

D. Programs and program providers should demonstrate significant transparency. Puget Sound and the committee should have access to information, external evaluations, peer reviews, and other information that will help us evaluate the program. Furthermore, programs offered by Puget Sound should be frequently reviewed by their providers, and that review process should include evaluations from external entities. Programs and program providers should be

responsive to the concerns of students, staff, and faculty of sending universities and colleges.

E. Programs added or retained should meet Puget Sound's academic standards. While the committee recognizes the intercultural diversity of pedagogical styles and standards, courses should be taught by faculty with demonstrable expertise in their fields, and coursework should complement the offerings of the University of Puget Sound.

Once these criteria were established the committee decided to form three subcommittees and begin the evaluation process on a regional basis. Each of these subcommittees were formed to examine all the available information in the university's possession related to Oceania, Asia, and Africa. Each subcommittee met 2-3 times to examine programs in each region. Their recommendations were as follows:

1. The Oceania recommends:
   a. dropping the Murdoch, Monash, Southern Cross and Australian National university programs.
   b. keeping Macquarie, Sydney, Adelaide, Canberra, James Cook, Melbourne and Tasmania University programs, as well as, SIT (Australia and Samoa) and SFS (Australia) programs
   c. changing the UPS/Griffith University program to an IFSA (Butler) program is the university moves to a one type program classification
   d. keeping all four New Zealand programs: Auckland, Canterbury, Otago and Victoria universities.

2. Africa and Middle-East

   The subcommittee recommended dropping a total of five programs from four providers. Those programs are:

   a. School for Field Studies-Kenya. This program has been suspended by SFS due to safety concerns.

   b. SUNY-Ghana. This program has attracted very few UPS students, and is in competition with more popular SIT-Ghana program

   c. Syracuse-Zimbabwe. This program was dropped by Syracuse, and is hence no longer a viable option

   d. School of International Training-Zimbabwe. This program is no longer offered by SIT, and hence can be dropped from our catalog of offerings.

   e. Interstudy programs at both Durban and Cape Town. Experiences vary greatly for the several universities that provide direct enrollment. We recommend either narrowing the options to one or two universities where

we can assure a positive experience for students, or switching to the AIFS direct enrollment program in South Africa.

Adding several programs to the list of programs considered for approved status (a task to be undertaken in the Fall). These would further promote the goals of the University, as codified in the Draft ISAC Program Evaluation Criteria. Those programs are:

a. The School of International Training-Jordan focuses on modernization and social change and will serve to expand our offerings in the Middle East. It is organized by SIT, a trusted provider.

b. The School of International Training-Middle East. This new program focuses on water issues and environmental sustainability in Egypt, Israel and Jordan, and will be an ideal program for students with an interest in Environmental Studies.

c. The School of International Training-Oman. This is a new and second program in Oman. This program is focused on International Economics, Energy, and Diversification, and while not currently offered, has already been of interest to students at the University of Puget Sound.

d. The School of International Training-Tunisia. This established program provides an excellent opportunity for students to study Maghreb culture and to study Arabic. Moreover, this program will provide students trained in French with additional options for fieldwork outside of France.

e. This subcommittee recognizes that while these recommendations go some distance toward the goal of expanding the geographical diversity of our offerings, we must endeavor to add additional program in the region to serve other majors and disciplines. We suggest that the committee actively seek boutique programs (directly organized by peer universities in the US) and direct enrollment programs (to replace those we are cutting above) that will expand opportunities in the region for our students.

f. This subcommittee would also like to recommend that all or most of the programs in Africa be changed to "Partner" programs to allow students to apply their UPS financial aid. This has made a significant difference in enrollment for SIT programs in the region; by unilaterally extending that status to other programs in the area, we will be encouraging students to study non-traditional programs in this otherwise under-represented area. It might also serve as a preliminary experience to broader changes for all our study abroad programs.

3. Asia:

The Asia subcommittee recommends keeping the current constellation of study abroad offerings in Asia, with the following exceptions, caveats, and recommendations:

a. IES Tokyo and IES Nagoya semester programs:
   We recommend our concerns about the quality of this program to the IES offices in Chicago, Tokyo, and Nagoya, and closely tracking their responsiveness to our concerns [in part by assessing student evaluations];

b. working with the International Program Office and Japanese language faculty to research other alternatives in Japan, and upon finding a suitable program, replacing IES Japan programs with a new program.

   IES Tokyo summer program: While we have not had historically significant enrollments in ICU, the Japanese language faculty has communicated that they would prefer students attend ICU in preference to IES. We therefore recommend that IES Tokyo *summer* program be dropped, and ICU *summer* kept.

c. IES Beijing: the committee therefore recommends contacting the provider with our concerns (via the International Program Office), and closely following the results,

f. closely tracking the evaluations of CIEE Beijing students in comparison,

g. returning to the question toward the end of 2008-9 of which provider we wish to go with for students wishing to study in Beijing, in consultation with language & area faculty

h. IES Delhi: UPS currently offers students a choice of two providers in India: IES Delhi and SIT (SIT offers two programs). [Not counting SIT Tibet, which is also in India]. We recommend: placing IES Delhi on probationary status for one year, during which time no new students would be allowed to apply,

i. forwarding our concerns to IES and closely following the results, while also closely tracking student evaluations of the program (UPS currently has students on the program)

j. researching alternative programs available to India, such as through Rutgers

k. returning to the question toward the end of 2008-9 of whether or not to keep IES Delhi, and/or whether to move to an alternate provider

4. Other committee actions related to programs.

Below are the programs that were officially cut this year and the appropriate offices on campus notified to remove them from their lists.

    a. DIS summer program; Waseda Oregon summer program; Gonzaga full year Florence program; SUNY Ghana program; Chinese University Hong Kong program; IES summer Tokyo program.

Other actions.

    b. ILACA London was moved from sponsored to partner status to align it with the ILACA Granada program.

    c. ISAC approved the ILACA Granada program

    d. Several members of ISAC attended a special session March 7, 2008 co-sponsored by UPS and PLU : "Legal and Risk Management Issues Related to the Operation of International Programs" presented by William P. Hoye, Executive Vice President for Administration, Planning and Legal Affairs at IES and a leading expert on safety, security, legal and risk issues affecting international programs.

Ongoing charges for the 2008-2009 International Education Committee (submitted by Alyce DeMarais):

1. Review and approve new and existing international education programs and program proposals, including programs led by university faculty.

2. Continue the comprehensive review of all study abroad programs offered through the university and revise the list based on geographical location and academic coverage.

3. Assist the Office of International Programs in selecting students for study abroad.

4. Review and ratify the study abroad mission statement.

5. Review the Study Abroad Working Group recommendations and determine if they should be endorsed.