

University of Puget Sound
Faculty Meeting Minutes
November 2, 2009

0. Tutorial on Parliamentary Procedure

Before the meeting, Professor David Droge provided a refresher course on parliamentary procedure. Handout appended to these minutes.

1. Call to Order

President Ron Thomas called the meeting to order at 4:30 p.m. in Thompson 193. At this time there were 35 attendees.

2. Approval of Minutes

The minutes for the meeting of May 5, 2009 were approved as posted

3. Announcements from the Floor—none.

4. President's Report

President Thomas reported that we have an unanticipatedly large freshman class. New student applications for next year are 38% above last year at this point. Anecdotal evidence and the comments of high school counselors suggest that the new marketing materials and website are being received positively. There were more than 30,000 unique visitors in the first three days of the new website, with an average visit time of 4 minutes and 83 foreign countries represented. Social networking features tied to the new website are being used as hoped.

We hosted a productive set of Board meetings a week ago in which the board reviewed the progress on and schedule for the capital campaign, received a progress report on strategic capital projects, welcomed three new board members, and anticipated the challenges of the year (and years) to come. A workshop on the campaign showed seismic shifts in the patterns of philanthropy nationally, with mega-gifts declining dramatically and a growing demand for longer periods of donor cultivation and more gifts in the \$50,000+ category. At Puget Sound we have seen several encouraging trends over the last few months: the Annual Fund is 20% above last year at this time and we have passed the \$50 million commitment mark for the campaign. Trustees also enjoyed attending classes and hearing presentations from several faculty and students.

5. Academic Vice-President's Report

Dean Kris Bartanen commended those responsible for achieving \$50 million in commitments, a significant milestone that was accomplished in 26 months, whereas in the last campaign it took 64 months. Faculty applauded.

Dean Bartanen reported that the faculty salary budget was flat for FY 2010 (no increase over FY 2009). We were able to cover steps and promotions through a combination of retirement savings and conservative leave replacement for the 12 FTE faculty on sabbaticals. We also absorbed into the budget a loss of endowed chair income equivalent to one position. For FY 2011, we will again be able to cover steps and promotions within the FY 2010 budget level; we will see a modest additional decline in

endowed chair income; and we will draw slightly more per award from the Lantz/Nelson endowment since replacement is costing us \$11,000 per unit on average. We have 14 applications for Lantz Fellowships and expect to make 5-7 awards. We have awarded 2 pre-tenure fellowships to both who applied, carrying forward remaining Mellon and other funds in order to be able to support the 14 and 12 junior faculty members eligible in the next two years, respectively. There are 27 senior faculty eligible for sabbatical each of the coming four years. Overall, we will need to cover 19 FTE leaves for academic year 2010-2011 very conservatively and appreciate your work with the deans as we work through the process.

The Academic and Student Affairs Committee of the Board again did not forward the proposed Faculty Bylaw amendment regarding the Diversity Committee to the full Board. Trustees affirmed understanding of the goals the amendment seeks to accomplish with a response group, but some committee members continue to have concern that proposed language of item 6.H.b.6 is unclear and overly broad, which could prove problematic in the future. Three trustees volunteered to collaborate informally on language that could be brought back to the March 2010 meeting.

6. Senate Chair's Report

Professor Doug Cannon reported that on behalf of the Faculty, he expressed appreciation to the President's cabinet for the one-time extra payment in October, and for their willingness to forego this payment themselves. He made this point to the Executive Committee and to the Board as a whole.

A report of the Senate's activities went to the Board. See the minutes for a full accounting. One representative action: taking account of the straw poll at the last Faculty meeting with regard to the Pass/Fail option, the Academic Standards Committee was asked to reconsider their advocacy of abolition.

With regard to the Diversity Bylaws, Professor Cannon agrees with Dean Bartanen's characterization: there is general agreement as to the aims of the change, and a willingness to collaborate, but the process before us is more daunting than the committee realized. It is up to the Faculty to revise the Bylaws, but these must be approved by the Board. Three members of the Academic and Student Affairs Committee of the Board agreed to be available for consultation to help ensure approval. If you are interested in helping to collaborate on a proposal, please contact Professor Cannon.

7. New Business: Proposed change in the rubric requirements for First Year Seminars to include language on academic honesty/integrity (revisions appended to these minutes)

Professor Derek Buescher introduced the Curriculum Committee's proposed revisions, intended to ensure universal coverage of academic integrity issues in both first-year seminars.

M/S to revise the rubric.

M/S/P to consider revision of WR and SCIS rubrics separately.

WR rubric revision passed by unanimous consent.

Animated discussion of SCIS rubric revision ensued. Points made by opponents:

- It unduly interferes in the ability of faculty to make their own decisions about what to cover and how, particularly the stipulation that academic integrity be “built in to seminar assignments.”
- The revision’s wording (“assignments”) may lead future Curriculum Committees to criticize teachers of SCISs for not having *multiple* assignments addressing academic integrity.
- Since the WR seminar rubric now includes academic integrity, perhaps it is overkill to include it in the SCIS rubric as well.
- *All* courses should convey the importance of academic integrity. We shouldn’t expect first-year seminars to miraculously end students’ ignorance of the need for appropriate source citation and prevent all future dishonesty.
- If the problem is not largely dishonesty but ignorance on students’ part, is “integrity” even really the issue? Students just need to learn to cite their sources properly.

Points made by revision supporters:

- Rubrics already define the content of core courses; they are intrusive by design.
- Why resist the revision for the SCIS, when the WR revision passed so swiftly?
- The rubric doesn’t require that a lot of class time be spent on academic integrity; it just needs to be included in an assignment.
- Stressing academic integrity is important work that requires consistency and repetition, and having this issue addressed by instructors in different disciplines will strengthen the message.
- Since some students take SCIS first and others WR first, both seminars should address academic integrity.
- Including academic integrity in the SCIS rubric formally demonstrates that we value it as a fundamental part of what it means to be a scholar in an academic community. Integrity is the cornerstone of “scholarly and creative inquiry.”
- This formalized commitment to scholarly integrity is especially important as our students’ approaches to research and knowledge are being shaped by the internet.
- The revision will stop students from claiming not to have known about the need for source citation—something some *seniors* are credibly able to claim now.
- It wouldn’t be fair to put the whole burden on the WR seminar instructors. If the SI seminars are too jam-packed with “content,” it’s because we choose to pack them, not because we’re obligated to.
- Although the issue may *now* be student ignorance rather than dishonesty, once all students are exposed to the need for appropriate citation, it will thereafter be a matter of choice and integrity.

M/S to strike part IV of the SCIS rubric revision (ending with “methods for addressing academic integrity are built in to seminar assignments”) **but retain the addition of “employing good practices of academic integrity” at the end of the top paragraph.**

Opponents of the motion said that this would make the revision toothless and vague, with no specific requirement for how academic integrity should be addressed. Supporters said it would keep the revision from being intrusive and requiring faculty to divert limited class time away from actual content. Opponents said that the revision as proposed is specific but also flexible and not onerous. Supporters said that we are passing language, not intent, and the revision’s language leaves open the possibility that future Curriculum Committees will expect multiple SCIS assignments to address academic integrity.

M/S/P to close debate.

The motion to strike part IV of the SCIS rubric revision was defeated.

M/S/P to close debate on the original motion.

The motion to adopt the revised language for the SCIS rubric passed 16-8.

M/S/P to adjourn the meeting.

8. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:33 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Gwynne Brown
Secretary of the Faculty