

Faculty Senate Minutes  
April 30, 2007

Members Present: Richard Anderson-Connolly, Barry Anton, Kris Bartanen, Nancy Bristow, Hart Edmonson, Robin Foster, Bill Haltom, John Hanson, Priti Joshi, Julie McGruder, Amy Ryken, Ross Singleton

Guests: Douglas Cannon, Alyce DeMarais, Grace Kirchner, Jim McCullough, Nila Wiese, Lisa Wood

Minutes of the April 16 Senate meeting were approved.

*Announcements*

Election Results (Senate Secretary Hanson)

Chair of Faculty Senate – Doug Cannon  
Senate Members – Richard Anderson-Connolly, Suzanne Holland, and Stacey Weiss

Hanson suggested the Senate form an ad hoc committee on election procedures. He identified a number of issues that arose during his administration of the recent election. See attached FacultyElections.doc for Hanson's discussion of those issues. Hanson also noted with appreciation the assistance with the election process provided by UPS student Ed Altorfer.

Dean Bartanen noted that John Finney will resign on May 18, 2007 vacating the position of Faculty Secretary. Because the Faculty Secretary is involved in scheduling work over the summer months, another member of the faculty will have to take over that responsibility soon. Chair Anton agreed to bring this issue up at the May 2 Faculty Meeting.

*Curriculum Committee Report* (Lisa Wood)  
See two attachments: "CC summary" and "CCfin"

Edmonson suggested that the recent difficulty attracting Yearbook staff might be addressed by offering academic or activity credit for such participation. The procedures for making such a request were described by Dean Bartanen.

Anderson-Connolly asked about the committee decision not to consider issues around the activity versus academic credit guidelines. Wood suggested that current case by case approach works.

Hanson asked for clarification of the issues surrounding double counting of academic credit. Wood explained and noted that changes in current practices regarding double counting were not recommended by the committee.

Bristow inquired as to the genesis of the committee's recommended Senate charge to the committee for 2007-2008 to consider issues surrounding the scheduling of class times. Wood indicated that was her own suggestion.

Anderson-Connolly asked if the working group structure described in the report was worth carrying over to next year. Wood said she favored the new structure but believed the decision should be made by the incoming chair.

Wood commented on the suggested committee charges recommended by Senator Ostrom. See attachment (Ostrom's Internship E-Mail.doc) for Ostrom discussion of those recommendations. While Wood agreed with Ostrom's recommendations she felt they should be subsumed under one charge so as not to carry too much weight relative to other important issues for the committee's consideration.

The Senate voted to receive the Curriculum Committee Report.

*Diversity Committee* (Nila Wiese)

See two attachments: "Diversity Committee Final Report" and "Admissions Retention Report"

Anderson-Connolly asked for more information on how last year's budget was spent. Wiese replied that it funded student participation in a diversity conference in Olympia. She further noted that the committee felt additional funding was appropriate to encourage more faculty participation at diversity conferences.

Bristow praised the completeness of the report and asked Wiese for recommendations regarding Senate charges to the committee. Wiese noted the committee felt it should have a higher profile role, a more central role and a more active role - perhaps acting as a clearing house for diversity activities and a forum for new initiatives.

McGruder commented on the "climate" issue discussed on p. 5 of the report. She reported that two Tacoma community member's request to bring a group of prospective students to campus met with a less than welcoming response from a staff member within Admissions. Dean Bartanen suggested there may have been one such incident but that she did not want to speak for George Mills. Bristow reported that she believed there were two such incidents in the recent past.

The Senate voted to receive the Diversity Committee Report.

*Professional Standard Committee Report* (Grace Kirchner)

See two attachments: "PSC 2006-7" and "amendment summary"

Kirchner noted that she will provide a list of pending tasks. She also responded to a communication from Senator Haltom regarding a code interpretation around the issue of early tenure and promotion. The committee determined that provisions within initial

appointment letters/contracts regarding early promotion and/or early tenure should be not be subject to the early tenure and promotion provisions in the Faculty Code.

Joshi believed the PSC had acted appropriately in interpreting the 1987 interpretation, but she found the 1987 policy puzzling and urged the Senate to examine the policy and “obstacles” to early tenure that currently exist, especially in light of junior faculty recruitment and retention and as part of our broader diversity efforts. Haltom clarified the issue by noting that Joshi’s suggestion, perhaps a good one, was a matter of changing policy whereas the job of the PSC was simply to interpret what the code actually says.

Haltom urged that departments be on board with any appointment letter/contract provision regarding early promotion or tenure.

Dean Bartanen suggested the Senate consider the special and exceptional provisions of the early tenure and promotions as contained in a 1987 PSC code interpretation as an early order of business in the coming academic year.

The Senate voted to receive the PSC Report.

*Sustained Service Award*

A faculty member was selected for the Senate’s Walter Lowry Sustained Service Award to be presented at the Fall Faculty Dinner.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ross C. Singleton

# Reflections on Faculty Elections

April 30, 2007

John Hanson, Faculty Senate Secretary

While preparing for and running the faculty elections this year I encountered a number of issues that I think should be discussed (see below). I recommend that the Faculty Senate create an Ad Hoc Committee on Elections to discuss these (and related) issues and make recommendations to the Faculty Senate regarding policies and procedures used in faculty elections. I recommend that this committee be chaired by the next Secretary of the Faculty Senate and that it include two additional members of the Faculty Senate and two members from the faculty.

One fundamental question that needs to be addressed is the type of voting procedure we should use. For the past two years we have tried using electronic voting using the ASUPS uvote system. While electronic voting seems to be popular among many faculty members, others have voiced concerns about the security and validity of electronic voting. I myself am concerned about using a system that we do not control and that we have not validated. I recommend that the Ad Hoc Committee discuss the relative merits of various voting procedures and make a recommendation to the Senate.

The Secretary of the Faculty Senate is charged with distributing and collecting ballots for the election. But there is no indication as to who should be involved in certifying the election that the Secretary ran. This is a potential weak point in the process. Especially since the Bylaws don't provide any provision for what should happen if the Secretary of the Faculty Senate is also running for a position! Presumably we don't want a candidate being the sole person running an election.

There are currently no procedures outlined in the bylaws for the election of the Faculty Senate Chair. (Article IV, Section 3.B.a. states "The Chairperson (III, 1, c)" For example, if there are three candidates should the winner of the election be declared the new Faculty Senate chair, or should there be a runoff, as is stipulated for the election of Faculty Senate members. I assume that the intention was that the same system used for electing senators would be used for electing the chair, but it doesn't actually state this.

Who decides on particulars of the voting system? As it reads now it looks like the Secretary of the Faculty Senate gets to do whatever he or she wants, as long as it doesn't violate anything in the bylaws. But there are lots of procedures that aren't stipulated in the bylaws. For example, should vote counts be announced? Again the bylaws are silent. It seems reasonable to make the Faculty Senate be the decision making body regarding elections, but I recommend that this be stated explicitly in the bylaws.

Given that there will be numerous voting procedures that are not (and probably should not) be outlined in the bylaws, there needs to be a document that the Faculty Senate Secretary can refer to that details the decisions made by the Senate (or whoever is anointed the governing body for elections). I recommend that a document outlining the voting procedures be created and posted on the Senate website. Each year, prior to the

election, the Senate can approve this document. If new issues arise that need to be incorporated into the election procedures the Senate can vote to amend the document. This will provide some continuity from election to election and ensure Senate oversight.

One question that the Faculty Senate secretary needs to address is validating the list of those eligible to vote. Especially with electronic elections, the Secretary needs to look at the list of voters that the computer is accessing when it decides who may vote and who may not. This list should be checked against a list maintained in by the Dean of the University. I recommend that this list be published on the web and freely accessible to any faculty member. That way any faculty member can check the list, to make sure that they are on it if eligible, and so that they can challenge any names that they believe should not be on it.

**Curriculum Committee  
Disposition of 2006-2007 Agenda**

**I. Departmental Reviews**

- 11/15/2006 English Department curriculum review accepted.
- 3/2/2007 Latin American Studies Program curriculum review accepted.
- 3/2/2007 Exercise Science Department curriculum review accepted.
- 3/2/2007 Geology Department curriculum review accepted.
- 3/2/2007 History Department curriculum review accepted.
- 3/2/2007 Physics Department curriculum review accepted.
- 3/30/2007 Chemistry Department curriculum review accepted.
- 4/20/2007 Internship and Cooperative Education program review continued.  
(Three internship-related motions passed; see below)

**II. On-going business**

**Academic Calendar**

- 10/11/2006 Full Academic Calendar for 2007-2008 and basic dates for 2010-2011 approved and sent to Faculty Senate.
- 10/11/2006 Approval of revisions to calendar setting guidelines to discontinue Summer terms B and C.

**Action on core courses**

- 10/4/2006 GEOL 115, Geomythology of Ancient Catastrophes, approved for the Scholarly and Creative Inquiry seminar core.
- 10/4/2006 HIST 115, The Crusades, approved for the Writing and Rhetoric seminar core.
- 10/4/2006 CONN 325, The Experience of Prejudice, approved for the Connections core.
- 10/18/2006 CONN 329, Communication Between Science and the Public, approved for the Connections core.
- 10/18/2006 CONN 303, The Monstrous Middle Ages, approved for the Connections core.
- 10/18/2006 HUM 305, Modernization and Modernism, approved for the Connections core.
- 11/15/2006 ART 120, Hagia Sophia: A Cross-Cultural Examination (6th to 21st C.), approved for the Scholarly and Creative Inquiry seminar core.
- 11/15/2006 REL 130, Lies, Secrets, and Power, approved for the Scholarly and Creative Inquiry seminar core.
- 11/15/2006 ENGL 201, Intermediate Writing and Rhetoric, approved for the Writing and Rhetoric seminar core.
- 11/15/2006 HUM 301, The Idea of the Self, approved for the Connections core.
- 1/26/2007 CONN 410, Making a Difference: Exploring the Ethics of Hope, approved for the Connections core.
- 2/9/2007 BIOL 240, Mysteries of Biology: Solved and Unsolved, approved for the Scholarly and Creative Inquiry seminar core.
- 2/9/2007 CONN 372, The Gilded Age: Literary Realisms and Historical Realities, approved for the Connections core for Summer 2007 only.
- 3/2/2007 ENGL 138, Sub/Urban America, approved for the Writing and Rhetoric seminar core.
- 3/2/2007 PHIL 109, Life, Death, and Meaning, approved for the Scholarly and Creative Inquiry seminar core.
- 3/2/2007 EDUC 110, Under Construction: Race, Sexuality, and Society, approved for the Writing and Rhetoric seminar core.
- 3/2/2007 IPE 389, Global Struggles over Intellectual Property, approved for the Connections core.
- 3/2/2007 STS 370, Science and Religion: Historical Perspectives, approved for the Connections core.
- 4/20/2007 COMM 258, Intercultural Communication, approved for Social Scientific Approaches core.

**III. Other Curricular Business**

- 9/6/2006 Approved deferral of International Programs curriculum review to 2007-2008.
- 9/6/2006 Approved minor revision to Self Study Guide, calling for double sided copies of syllabi.
- 9/20/2006 Approved the list of curricular actions delegated to the Associate Dean, deleting provisional approval of Approaches core courses.

- 10/18/2006 Ratified current practices of the Registrar's Office with regard to the implementation of the upper division requirement.
- 12/6/2006 Approved the addition of two regular [non-contract] majors and modification of the contract majors in Mathematics and Computer Science.
- 12/6/2006 Voted to "do nothing" about double counting of academic units.
- 4/20/2007 Three motions were passed regarding internship courses.
- a. The interdisciplinary internship seminar will carry a single prefix (to be determined later, e.g. INTN). The course number will remain 497.
  - b. Any internship seminar given by an academic department will carry the department prefix. These are courses developed and reviewed by departments (e.g. ENGL 497).
  - c. The interdisciplinary internship seminar may not be used to fulfill the upper division (three units outside the first major) breadth requirement in the core.

### **Core Reviews**

- 3/30/2007 Approved Humanistic Approaches core review.
- 4/20/2007 Approved Fine Arts Approaches core review.

### **Interim Study Abroad Committee program approvals.** Accepted the following programs:

- 10/4/2006 IES Tokyo summer (Partner)
- 10/4/2006 IES Barcelona summer (Partner)
- 10/4/2006 IES Amsterdam (Partner)
- 10/4/2006 IES India (Delhi). (Partner)
- 10/4/2006 IES Milan summer (Partner)
- 10/4/2006 IES Melbourne summer (Partner)
- 10/4/2006 IES Rome summer (Partner)
- 10/4/2006 SIT Oman (Approved)
- 10/4/2006 Denmark International Studies Program (DIS). (Approved)
- 10/4/2006 IES Tokyo summer, effective summer 2007 (Partner)
- 10/4/2006 IES Barcelona summer, effective summer 2007 (Partner)
- 10/4/2006 IES Amsterdam, effective fall 2007 (Partner)
- 10/18/2006 Universidad de Santiago de Compostela (Spain), Spring semester program (Approved).
- 1/26/2007 Institute for the International Education of Students, European Union Summer Program (Partner)
- 1/26/2007 Institute for the International Education of Students, Quito Summer Program (Partner Program)
- 1/26/2007 Institute for the International Education of Students, Quito Semester Program (Partner)
- 1/26/2007 Institute for the International Education of Students, Santiago Summer Program (Partner)
- 1/26/2007 School for International Training, Rwanda/Uganda Summer Program (Partner)
- 1/26/2007 School for International Training, Peru Semester Program (Partner)
- Provisional approval granted
- 1/26/2007 Currently approved School for International Training (SIT) programs approved for Partner program status.
- 4/20/2007 Temple Rome (Partner)

### **IV. Business to be carried over to 2007-2008**

Connections: Continue discussion of issues raised at 4.13-4.20 meetings regarding course approval practices and issues of consistency across years/committees (see minutes and related attachment from Minutes of 4.13 and 4.20)

Internship and Cooperative Education Review: Address remaining elements of the review.

**V. Departmental reviews scheduled for 2007-2008**

Art  
Classics  
Communication Studies  
Education  
Honors  
Humanities  
International Programs  
Theatre Arts

**VI. Core Reviews scheduled for 2007-2008**

Social Scientific Approaches  
Connections



To: Faculty Senate and Professor Barry Anton (chair)

From: Professor Lisa Fortlouis Wood

Re: Final Report of the Curriculum Committee 2006-7

Attached please find a complete list of the actions taken by the Curriculum Committee during the 2006-2007 academic year.

Highlights: We completed seven department reviews, with one more ongoing. Additionally, the committee approved the proposed academic calendar for 2007-8 and basic dates for 2010-11 along with revisions to the calendar setting guidelines for summer terms. The committee approved 19 new courses across the university curriculum and approved the core reviews for humanistic and fine arts approaches. We ratified current practices of the Registrar's office with regard to the upper division core requirement outside the major and voted to "do nothing" about double counting of academic units. We passed three motions regarding the internship courses as part of our ongoing review of the internship program.

We deferred the review of International Programs to 2007-2008 and accepted the Interim Study Abroad Committee Program approvals for 21 programs world wide.

Comments from the Chair: It is most important to note that we had a very cohesive and hardworking committee this year, with consistent and high-quality notes provided by Professor Suzanne Barnett. Several staff members facilitated our work, with Associate Dean, Alyce DeMarais serving with wisdom on all working groups, and Assistant Dean Carrie Washburn providing much needed expertise and guidance on process, committee history, and documentation requirements. In addition, Registrar, Brad Tomhave provided data on registration patterns and enrollments as we considered various questions regarding how students fulfill requirements. Assistant Registrar, Lori Blake served in Brad Tomhave's stead when he was unable to attend meetings; several members of the registrar's office also joined us when we had questions relevant to their work. We also found support in the Academic Advising Office from Director, Jack Roundy and his staff. Librarian, Lori Ricigliano, served as staff representative on the committee and is appreciated for her ongoing participation in our work. Thank you to all members of the committee.

Committee Structure and Process: The committee completed its work for the year on April 20, 2007. The committee was divided into 5 working groups made up of newer and more experienced faculty across varied disciplines. Committee members stayed with the same working group all year and each group was led by an experienced member of the curriculum committee. The purpose of this approach was to simplify the assignment process, to foster closer working relationships among faculty, to simplify scheduling for faculty and the associate dean (who sits on every working group or subcommittee) and to provide a clear and consistent framework for meetings. This "working group" structure

also provided a consistent framework for meeting notes and the tracking of completed work.

One concern emerged this year regarding equity in the distribution of workload. Some members of the committee and some working groups reported a significantly heavier workload than others. As noted in the self-evaluation document (see attachment to 4.20.07 minutes), attention to the matter of assignments at the outset and mid-year would likely remedy this imbalance. A second issue with this model rests in the possibility that members of working groups who are more experienced or more vocal may possibly have a greater influence on decision processes and may inadvertently shape the values of newer members. Further, because the groups stay together throughout the year, newer members may have significantly less exposure to a wide-range of faculty views as compared to the more varied sub-committee model. This is a clear trade-off and may be a bigger problem in some groups as compared with others depending on individual faculty involved. One remedy for this possible of imbalance is to foster whole committee conversations on topics of critical import or interest, so that a variety of views and values can be shared more widely.

In sum, the working group approach holds promise, especially if the above caveats are addressed proactively. It may be prudent for the new chair of the Curriculum Committee to review the self-assessment document in order to consider whether or not this approach will be appropriate for the committee in the coming year. Overall, members of the committee were positive about committee process this year.

**The following items are suggested for next year's Senate charges:**

1. Complete remaining business related to the review of the academic internship courses.
2. Continue the on-going business of the Committee including: 5 year reviews of departments and programs, ongoing assessment of core rubrics, review of international study programs.
3. Continue ongoing discussion of the Connections rubric with regard to issue of consistency of approval practices across committees and subcommittees.
4. Consider whether or not it is appropriate for the Curriculum Committee to address the scheduling of class times as part of its ongoing charges.

Submitted: April 24, 2007 by: Lisa Fortlouis Wood, Committee Chair

E-Mail Excerpts from Senator Ostrom

The Curriculum Committee is in the process of reviewing internships, and I'd like to add some suggestions for this review as it continues next year. I was hoping that if I don't make it to the Senate on time, you might just enter these into the record on Monday so that the Senate may discuss them when it articulates committee-charges next year.

1. Gather data about internships at a few universities comparable to UPS to see how we measure up with regard to the number and variety of internships our students pursue.

1. Survey a sample of recent alumni who had internships while at UPS to get a sense of how they view the internship-process.

1. Consider whether earning 2 units for an especially challenging, time-consuming internship might be possible.

I'll send a copy of this to Lisa Wood and Alyce DeMarais, too.

Thank you, Barry!

All best,

Hans

# **Committee on Diversity**

## **2006-7 Annual Report**

### **Introduction**

The Diversity Committee engaged in a variety of activities during the 2006-7 academic year. The Committee's discussions were rich and varied, reflecting the diverse backgrounds and perspectives of Committee members. The Diversity Committee is, appropriately, one of the largest standing committees of the faculty and includes a significant number of student and staff members. Because issues related to diversity cut across the University community, it is essential to the Committee to include members representing the full range of constituencies on the University campus. To present a clear picture of our activities during the year, we have followed previous practice and reported our work on a charge-by-charge basis.

### **Committee on Diversity**

The membership of the 2006-2007 Diversity Committee consisted of Kim Bobby (Representing George Mills, Jr., Vice President for Enrollment), Monica DeHart (Comparative Sociology), Janet Marcavage (Art), Rosa Beth Gibson (Associate Vice President for Human Resources), Mike Segawa (Dean of Students), Ed Cole (Facilities Services), Nila Wiese, Chair (Business and Leadership), Mikiko Ludden (Foreign Languages and Literature), Mike Valentine (Geology), Harry Velez-Quinones (Foreign Languages and Literature), Michelle A. Stoler (Student), JD Barton (Student), Heather Clifford (Dining and Conference Services), Danielle M. Drangsholt (Student), Jim McCullough (Business and Leadership), Yoshiko Matsui (Multicultural

Services), Carrie Washburn (Representing Kris Bartanen, Academic Vice President and Dean of the University).

The committee received seven charges from the Faculty Senate and these charges are used to structure the report of our work presented below. These charges, shown in italics, were specific, gave the committee initial direction, and helped guide the year's activity. The committee was given a small budget to support activities to assist in completing its work. The members held regular and active discussions of a broad range of diversity related issues, but two major concerns that emerged for consideration and discussion by the committee were faculty participation in recruiting in support of diversity and development of student organizations supporting diverse groups. Although all charges were addressed, discussion and member involvement in these two areas dominated the year and significant progress was made in these areas. A subcommittee made significant progress in the development of an incident response team as well.

### **Review of Charges for 2006-2007**

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

Throughout the year the committee remained in close contact with Human Resources as Rosa Beth Gibson, Associate Vice President for Human Resources, was a member of the committee and with the Office of Admission as Kim Bobby, Director of Access Programs, represented Vice President for Enrollment George Mills on the Committee. The Diversity Committee met

with representatives of the Office of Admission to discuss faculty roles in recruiting students. The discussion included a number of suggestions about how to contact and convince students of color to join the UPS community.

*2. Implementation of the Bias and Hate Educational Response Team to address trends and incidents related to diversity.*

An implementation plan for the Bias and Hate Educational Response Team was approved by the Diversity Committee in January and has been submitted by the Committee on Diversity to the Faculty Senate. Implementation is awaiting action by the Faculty Senate and implementation of the Diversity Strategic Plan. The Committee on Diversity does not believe it has the authority to implement this team.

*3. Continue a program of national participation by sending delegates to gather and disseminate information at one of the several conferences devoted to diversity issues in higher education. This should include support and participation in the National Race and Pedagogy Conference at Puget Sound.*

Committee members provided active support for the Race and Pedagogy conference held at Puget Sound and also attended many of the plenary sessions and workshops.

*4. 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 These Year, and other existing and emerging organizations and programs.*

The Committee began the year by assigning members in liaison role to student organizations to improve communication and provide support when necessary. Committee members were assigned as liaison to the following student groups: APASU, DTY, BGLAD, Race and Pedagogy, Black Student Union, Community for Hispanic Awareness, International Club, Hui-O-Hawaii, Jewish Student Organization, Muslim Student Alliance, Pagan Student Alliance, Sexuality Issues, Relationships, and Gender Exploration, Voices for Planned Parenthood, Vagina Anti-Violence Alliance. The committee worked to show support to groups like the Buddhist Student Group and CHispA that are becoming active or in the process of re-organizing.

- 5. Support the Diversity Planning Task Force (DPTF) in developing and implementing the Strategic Diversity Plan for the Puget Sound campus.*

The report of the DPTF has been completed and an executive summary has been distributed to the campus community. The Diversity Committee discussed its role in light of this charge and felt the Senate and the Administration need to provide guidance as to the role of the committee in addressing this charge before specific action could be undertaken by Committee.

- 6. Work with 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, staff, and faculty.*

The Faculty Senate charged the Committee on Diversity to “gather and analyze data (covering several years) from the Admission office regarding the number of applications from different minority groups, the number of such applications accepted, and the resulting yield (students enrolled). Link these data to geographical data (e.g. from which states do we get the most applications from African American students, Latino students, Asian American students, and so on.) Present these data and the analysis to the Faculty Senate.” It was felt that proposing changes to University documents should be postponed until results of this analysis and the Campus Climate Survey were released. The recruitment report has been submitted to the Faculty Senate by the Committee on Diversity, and only preliminary results of the Campus Climate Survey results have been released.

*7. Complete the committee self-evaluation process.*

The self-evaluation process was completed and submitted to the Faculty Senate on time. This charge led to active discussion about the appropriate roles for the Committee on Diversity. The Senate was urged in the assessment to address this issue.

*8. Gather and analyze data (covering several years) from the Admission office regarding the number of applications from different minority groups, the number of such applications accepted, and the resulting yield (students enrolled). Link these data to geographical data (e.g. from which states do we get the most applications from African American students, Latino students, Asian American students, and so on.) Present these data and the analysis to the Faculty Senate.*



The requested report on admission and retention data of minority students was completed and submitted to the Faculty Senate.

### **Proposed Charges for 2007-2008**

The members of the Committee on Diversity concur in suggesting that a set of carefully focused charges with specific goals and outcomes provide the most appropriate guidelines for the work of the Committee. The Committee felt strongly that the Faculty Senate needs to address the recommendation for additional guidance on the role of the Committee in coordination of diversity activities before a complete set of charges is developed. This has not been accomplished at this time. The following proposed charges reflect the insights that have emerged from the Committee's experience this year. These should be more fully developed and the list of charges revised after the Senate review of the Committee's Self-Assessment.

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

*4. Work with 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, staff, and faculty.*

*5. Support the Diversity Planning Task Force (DPTF) in developing and implementing the Strategic Diversity Plan for the Puget Sound campus.*

The committee will request continuation of the budget allocation from the Associate Dean to support the work of the Committee on Diversity. It is suggested that the committee develop a budget to assist with the requesting and expending of financial support.

## **Report from the University Committee on Diversity to the Faculty Senate:**

### **Admission and Retention of Minority Students 2006-2007**

#### **I. UNIVERSITY'S STRATEGIC GOALS**

The University's Strategic Plan, completed in 2005-06, states that its first strategic goal is to enhance and enrich the Puget Sound experience to build upon our reputation for distinguished teaching and learning. It goes on to state that Puget Sound will be nationally recognized for providing a campus community that embraces cultural diversity.

The Diversity Planning Task Force was charged with developing a strategic plan for diversity. In its final recommendations, the Diversity Strategic Plan has as Strategic Goal I, to increase the recruitment and retention of students, staff and faculty from underrepresented minority groups. Objectives under this goal include:

- a) Improve the campus' structural diversity by increasing the number of faculty, staff, and students from underrepresented minority groups.
- b) Improve the quality of experiences for underrepresented minority groups of students, staff, and faculty.
- c) Promote the success and retention of underrepresented minority individuals.

It is in line with these goals, that the University Committee on Diversity, as charged by the Faculty Senate, undertook an extensive analysis of activities and data regarding recruitment, admission, and retention of students from underrepresented groups. Our primary focus was on identifying barriers or challenges faced by students from racial and ethnic minority groups that might prevent them from enrolling at Puget Sound and successfully completing their studies.

We received the support of Admissions and Financial Aid, primarily through information received from both offices, and visits with Melanie Reed and Maggie Mittuch. We also acknowledge information provided by George Mills and Dean Kris Bartanen.

In the following sections, we present a summary of the Committee's analysis and recommendations. Generally, the Committee found that while there have been small increases in the absolute number of diverse students enrolling at Puget Sound, the institution continues to fall well short of its overall vision of qualitatively improving the cultural diversity of this campus.

## II. WHERE WE ARE

A cursory review of the admissions and enrollment data for a three-year period (2004-06) demonstrates several problematic patterns in the recruitment of a more diverse student body.

1. While the numbers indicate an absolute increase in the number of minority students enrolled, that increase is so low (27 additional minority students between 2004-05, and only one additional student of color between 2005-06), that they do not represent a significant shift in the diversity of our campus (see Table 1).
2. The small absolute increase in minority student enrollment obscures the fact that there has been no consistent increase in the yield percentage of diverse students over the past three years. In fact, between 2005 and 2006, the percentage of diverse students enrolled actually declined in two of the four ethnic groups (African American and Hispanic/Latino). Therefore, admission and enrollment data reveal neither a consistent improvement in yield percentages over time, nor a proportionate success rate across minority groups.
3. The minority group enrollment rates that account for the highest absolute numbers are those of Asian Americans (see Table 2). Therefore, our total increase in minority student enrollment reflects primarily gains in the recruitment of the minority group that already has the largest presence on campus. This phenomenon raises the question of whether University diversity goals reflect an interest in increasing enrollment of one or another particular underrepresented group or whether it seeks to expand student diversity more broadly.
4. The top ten majors preferred<sup>1</sup> by minority students' were: Business Administration, Education, Biology, Physical Therapy, Psychology, English, Foreign Languages, IPE, Politics and Government, and Computer Science, and Mathematics.

**Table 1. Applications and Enrollment per Minority Group (2004-2006)**

<b>2006</b>	<b>AF-AM</b>	<b>H/L-AM</b>	<b>NH_NA</b>	<b>AS-AM</b>
Number of Applications	150	211	111	449
Number of Acceptances	91	139	77	327
<b>Number of Enrolled (total 120)</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>62</b>
Yield % for each	20.9	15.1	23.4	19.0
<b>2005</b>				
Number of Applications	113	195	93	378
Number of Acceptances	83	144	65	304
<b>Number of Enrolled (total 119)</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>53</b>
Yield % for each	30.1	20.8	16.9	17.4
<b>2004</b>				
Number of Applications	75	179	75	362
Number of Acceptances	51	132	50	285
<b>Number of Enrolled (total 92)</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>47</b>
Yield % for each	15.7	18.2	26.0	16.5

<sup>1</sup> This list is based on aggregate data that groups students from all ethnic/racial categories graduating in 2003-05, based on first major.

**Table 2. Percentage Enrollment per Minority Group (2001-2005)**

	<b>2006</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2001</b>
<b>White</b>	75.5	73	75.3	77.5	77.3	78.9
<b>Asian/Pacific Islander</b>	<b>9.1</b>	7.9	7.0	8.3	8.7	<b>6.8</b>
<b>African American</b>	<b>2.9</b>	3.7	1.2	2.3	2	<b>2.1</b>
<b>Hispanic</b>	<b>2.9</b>	4.5	3.6	3.1	3.3	<b>2.7</b>
<b>Native American</b>	<b>1.9</b>	1.2	1.3	1.6	0.2	<b>1.1</b>
<b>Native Hawaiian</b>	<b>0.9</b>	0.6	0.7	0.3	0.3	<b>1.1</b>
<b>Other</b>	0.6	0.6	1.3	1.1	0.5	0.6
<b>Foreign</b>	0.3	0.4	0	0.5	0.3	0.9
<b>Unknown</b>	6	8.1	9.5	8.1	7.4	6

### **III. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### **A. RECRUITMENT**

The Committee would like to recognize the work being done by the Admissions' staff. They have an active program of recruitment including activities directed at diverse potential applicants. Yet, many of the activities seemed aimed at making contact rather than insuring enrollment by the student. Therefore, while Admissions' efforts represent a genuine commitment to increasing diversity, those efforts are hampered by both limited resources and a lack of specific institutional objectives with regard to diversity recruitment. What may, at first glance, appear to be a problem of admissions recruitment is thus better understood as a reflection of the absence of concrete institutional goals and sufficient resources to support and orient Admissions' efforts related to diversity.

#### **The Pool**

In general, Puget Sound focuses its efforts on heavy outreach to public schools in Western Washington and the Portland area as distance is a factor for many, but not all, of our enrolling students of color. For example, in the 2006-07 first-year class, 75% of the enrolling African-American students came from Washington State high schools. For other ethnic groups, the breakdown is generally 50% enrollees from Washington State and 50% from around the nation.

#### **Recruitment Activities**

2006-07 marked the third year that Puget Sound organized a November workshop for prospective students of color from Western Washington and Oregon.

Melanie Reed and T'wina Franklin, Admission's Student Coordinator for Multicultural Enrollment, founded the program D.O.C.C. (Diversity on Campus Coalition) in 2005-06. The DOCC brings together current students and diverse methods of reaching out to, and advising, prepared prospective Puget Sound students. Activities undertaken by the DOCC and by the Office of Admissions are included in Appendices A and B.

In addition, the University participates in the Access Program. This is a pipeline program serving 7<sup>th</sup> through 12<sup>th</sup> grade students in our local schools. The goal is to expose students who are historically underrepresented in higher education to opportunities to enrich their academic performance, build networks with college students and faculty, and become better prepared to attend college. Each year since 1999, there have been Access Programs students in our freshman class.

**Financial Aid**

Average financial need and institutional award packages by ethnicity of all undergraduate students who demonstrate need (includes students not receiving the Opportunity Grant) is detailed below. Table 3b also shows the average financial aid received by students from minority groups as compared to the entire student population. Students from minority groups seem to receive financial aid comparable to that of the entire student population; however, their average need exceeds the amount of institutional aid they receive.

**Table 3a. Average Financial need and Institutional Award Packages (2006)**

	<u>Average Need</u>	<u>Average Inst'l Package</u>
African American	\$34,680	\$19,035
American Indian	34,435	16,475
Hispanic	30,185	13,160
Asian	28,420	14,010
Caucasian	28,310	15,995
Other	27,810	13,140
Native Hawaiian	26,780	13,395

**Table 3b. Financial aid, scholarships, loans, and work-study from all sources**

	Students of Diversity		Entire Population	
	FR	Undergrad	FR	Undergrad
<b>Total Awarded</b>	\$3,546,000	\$13,575,000	\$9,556,000	\$36,634,000
<b>Average per Student</b>	\$27,900	\$27,500	\$24,503	\$24,800

**B. RETENTION**

Retention rates are the percentage of new freshman cohorts that are enrolled in succeeding fall semesters. As the number of ethnic minority students in an annual cohort group can be fairly small, the retention rates can be quite unstable. For the purpose of comparing the retention rate of different freshman cohorts, the average over five years is a better measure. The average of one-year retention rates over the last five years for all Puget Sound students was 86%. Native American, Asian American, International, and white student rates all cluster around 86%. African American and Hispanic rates cluster around 80%.

Graduation rates are the cumulative percentage of students from entering cohorts that have graduated by the end of each summer semester. The average four-year graduation rate over the past five years for all Puget Sound students was 66%. For students taking up to 6 years to

graduate, the rate is 74%. White students have slightly higher rates on both measures. The four-year graduation rates for ethnic minority students fall anywhere between 1 to 11 points lower than white students, and the 6 year graduation rates fall between 4 and 15 points lower than white students.

Retention of students receiving Opportunity Grants is lower than average: 79% of the students awarded in 2005-06 are currently enrolled; 21% withdrew from the university. As stated above, Puget Sound normally retains about 86% of its freshman from first to second year.

### **C. BARRIERS IDENTIFIED**

This analysis of barriers to diversity recruitment and retention was based on the limited data provided to the Committee and its frequently anecdotal quality. A more comprehensive portrait of barriers to diversity recruitment and retention will require additional data in order to more fully explain and substantiate the contours of many of the obstacles described herein.

1. Liberal arts education is not likely to be the first choice of students from ethnic and racial minority groups.
2. Minority students who are exceptionally qualified academically are likely to have admission offers from top schools and are likely to receive financial aid packages with which Puget Sound cannot compete.
3. Admission lacks concrete and measurable objectives that can provide strategic direction and performance measurements regarding the recruitment of diverse students.
4. Structural barriers fall into three categories:
  - a) First, students from minority groups may not be as academically well-prepared as compared to their full class (i.e., they usually rank at the lower end of the academic scale), thus placing them at a disadvantage in terms of their propensity for receiving sufficient financial assistance at the onset. For example, only 46% of students receiving aid through the Opportunity Grant Program are receiving merit scholarships. On average, 60% of our entering class receives merit aid. Differing levels of academic preparation may also impact minority students' academic success and retention rates over the longer term.
  - b) The climate encountered by students from minority groups may not be as welcoming and/or supporting, thus alienating them even more. Findings from the campus climate for diversity survey provide some support for this statement. Results from the survey indicate that only 21 students from underrepresented ethnic groups completed the survey (11% of enrolled Black, Latino/a, or Native American students, compared to the 24% overall student response rate). Puget Sound was considered less diverse than students' home communities by 42% of respondents, and less diverse than students' high schools by 47%. Also, one-third of the incidents of discrimination or harassment reported by students of color had to do with ethnicity. Finally, Asian-

American students rated the climate for ethnic differences less favorably than other students and they were less likely to agree that the classroom climate was welcoming, and the faculty were sensitive to multicultural concerns. This is an interesting finding since it comes from the largest ethnic student group on campus.

- c) Financial Aid: Even providing financial aid equivalent to full tuition, students from minority groups face financial and academic constraints that need to be addressed in order to increase both enrollment and retention. (see Appendix C)

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **1. Need for concrete, measurable objectives**

Concrete, measurable objectives are essential to producing the qualitative improvement in campus diversity that the University seeks to achieve. Concrete, measurable objectives provide direction in the allocation of resources and signaling of commitment; they also become benchmarks against which to measure “success.” The Administration in conjunction with the Faculty Senate, should establish goals for recruiting, enrolling, and retaining students from various underrepresented groups, in line with the Strategic Goal I included in the Diversity Strategic Plan.

### **2. Need for an integrated, holistic approach:**

- Increasing the numbers of faculty of color
- Identifying students earlier (perhaps their junior year in high school)
- Providing review programs the summer of freshman year that better prepare minority students, and mentoring and other academic support throughout the first two years of college (or longer).
- Increasing financial aid available to minority students

### **3. Faculty Involvement**

The Administration and the Faculty Senate need to send a clear signal to the faculty that activities directly related to increasing and improving diversity on campus will be recognized, valued, and rewarded in the faculty evaluation process.

In addition to evaluative incentives, the institution needs to provide faculty with the training and tools necessary to effectively support diverse students’ academic and personal growth. Many faculty members do not know how to go about identifying the barriers faced by individual students and/or providing support for those students. Training programs would communicate the institution’s investment in constructing a more educated and sustainable environment for diversity, and would lay the foundation for a campus-wide community network of support. They would also open up possibilities for faculty conversation and collaboration on diversity issues across single disciplines.



## Appendix A: Summary of Activities of the Diversity on Campus Coalition: The Year in D.O.C.C.

### August and Early Fall

#### **Table at the Activities Fair**

**Diversity Center BBQ. D.O.C.C. members attend.**

**Cornel West - DOCC members attend**

#### **Regular duties to attack each week between times DOCC meet:**

- Send email to admission counselors urging them to let you know when they meet a student from a diverse population they'd like you to contact via email or phone. Ask to receive contact information about the student when they send you the names.
- Contact those students.
- Ask Melanie to run list of high school seniors who are prospects of color for emailing and phoning.
- Contact those students.
- Attend Governing Council.
- Send Governing Council and DOCC activity updates to admission counselors (above).
- Find out which faculty member is heading up Faculty Diversity Committee and send that person minutes from Governing Council and DOCC also.
- Go find, or email, or call Mike Rottersman ([mroppersman@ups.edu](mailto:mroppersman@ups.edu), x3959) who is now in charge of the Campus Visit Program and introduce yourself, let him know we can partner with him on different diversity groups he hears about that visit campus. If Mike is aware of groups that call Admission that may want to meet with members of DOCC, coordinate with you. Mike should let the front office staff (Sandy and Stephanie) know this, too.

#### **Other Items to Consider Throughout the Year**

- How can we measure D.O.C.C. success?
- How can we say D.O.C.C. improved from one year to the next?
- What is the best process to update this document as we go?
- Should there be a year-end report? What form should it take?
- Geoff Proehl is interested in working on diversity issues that relate to theatre; diversifying the pool of auditioners and reaching out to prospective theatre students of color. Something to revisit.

### Later Fall

Start planning for on-campus local students of color workshop

- Date: Sunday, November 18
- Talk to Sally Sprenger about inviting or including international students somehow.
- How to make the day as helpful as possible and as illustrative as possible about life here? What did we like last year? What didn't we like?
- Contact same middle school group to participate?
- How to improve? How better to incorporate alumni? How to better incorporate diversity clubs and organizations? Perhaps representatives from each could host tables at dinner?
- Mass mailing planning forms complete for each of the mailings: Invite, letter to alumni of color, letter to alumni of MAT (attached – copy previous years' from file folder)
- Request from MAT (School of Education main phone line) list of alumni teaching locally (electronic, if possible? In Excel?). List should go to Luanne ([lhmeyer@ups.edu](mailto:lhmeyer@ups.edu)) when it arrives with a note that says it's for the student of color/alumni of MAT mailing.
- Request from Ed Snyder ([esnyder@ups.edu](mailto:esnyder@ups.edu)) a list of Western Washington Alumni of Color.
- Faculty participants (introduce at Friday morning's Faculty Diversity Committee meeting?) – *Notify early and follow-up regularly beforehand.*

- Talk to Mike about tours; possible Nikki or Tyeshia could do? Tell Mike ([bsnider@ups.edu](mailto:bsnider@ups.edu)) we will need three tour guides
- What should we have available for students? Does each diversity organization have handouts we could provide on a table?
- Create or update event evaluation; include in packet
- Full write-up of what went well and what didn't, what to change in the future, for your notebook and for next year's Coordinator.

### **Spring To-Do (Continued)**

- Find as much specific information as possible about D.O.C.C. events and provide Melanie with date, time, price, location, exact title, and whether adult content for each (T'wina)
- Confirm that DOCC hosts will be present with the students throughout, possibly assign different DOCC members to each (T'wina)
- Develop system for tracking RSVPs and buying tickets for events (T'wina and Melanie)
- Determine what to do with each event if no one RSVPs (T'wina and Melanie)
- Mass emailing form(s) for events (Melanie)
- Reminder phone calls to those who received the mass emails (T'wina)
- Email out plan for where to meet and what to do for each event shortly before each event to DOCC members after conversation with Melanie (T'wina)
- What form do we want DOCC to take in Spring Campus Day? Different from last year.
- Run list of admitted students of color weekly (Mondays beginning early March) with email and phone contact information (Melanie)
- T'wina to email and/or phone all admitted students of color before April 27; ensure needs are met, refer financial aid questions to area counselors or to financial aid for follow-up; refer all other questions to area counselors or to financial aid for follow-up
- Work with Daniel to develop system by which T'wina can track the calls she's made to admitted students of color (Melanie and T'wina)
- For African American admitted students specifically, have files pulled for those admitted and develop profiles of what each might need to enroll so T'wina knows what to target when contacting them
- Distribute names and contact information for admitted African American students to faculty who volunteered to help call or email admitted students of color and let them know a little information (above) about each; also that T'wina will be contacting them.
- Melanie and T'wina talk to Carolyn about T'wina contacting admitted transfer students of color
- Do we want a DOCC presence on the diversity page that links from admission?
- Consider who might be a good Student Diversity Coordinator next fall
- Can we get this person in here to talk to T'wina and Melanie before the end of the year? The new Student Coordinator should shadow T'wina to ensure smooth transition.
- Can this person develop in conjunction with the orientation committee a SWAT-esque move-in and greeting crew for freshman student of color arrival?
- Work with orientation committee on post-"I Am Puget Sound" reception in Diversions
- Updates to Faculty Diversity Committee about progress and success at the end of the cycle
- Continue to copy Yoshiko and DSA
- Draft a mass email to prospective or admitted students of color this spring over T'wina's signature asking if students have questions about the college; embedded with helpful links. (Work with communication folks on this.)
- Developing a calendar pre-DOCC meeting of events this spring where we would love DOCC presence and making it available to DOCC members for sign-up (examples might be campus visit groups)

### **Slightly Later in the Spring**

- Execute DOCC involvement in Spring Campus Day.
- Finalize SWAT-esque DOCC move-in team for new student orientation
- Correspondence from current students in DOCC over the summer inviting entering students of color to the diversity reception in Diversions after the “I Am Puget Sound” program
- Planning the diversity reception for orientation in conjunction with the orientation staff
- Prep for next fall hiring for T’wina’s position, review of year, specific to-do timeline of year, calendar in place for hiring and work for next fall
- Transfer of all responsibilities to new Student Coordinator for Multicultural Enrollment.
- Final revisions on this document with updates from this year.

### **Pre-Academic Year (August?)**

- How we want to get in touch with continuing DOCC students
- Coordinator work hours confirmed
- Fall meetings on the books and advertised to DOCC
- Diversity clubs present at fair-style get-together in Diversions, advertised at the “I am Puget Sound” event and immediately afterward
  - Promote to diversity clubs/orgs heads as way to contact freshmen immediately and advertise diversity BBQ at Diversity Center
  - Get Diversity Center information and work with Yoshiko to create handouts for the Diversions get together
- Plan for the Activity Fair

## **Appendix B: Sample of Activities Undertaken by the Admissions Office**

- Hosting Whitney Laughlin's College Horizons program, bringing 86 Native American youth from around the nation to campus for a week-long workshop this summer at Puget Sound's expense. (Rice hosted College Horizon's other week.) Puget Sound sent Admission faculty to this program at other sites in 2004 and 2005.
- Partnering with area schools in Puget Sound's Access Programs, where Kim Bobby works with a cohort of 7-12<sup>th</sup> graders in a "pipeline" of college preparedness.
- Bringing Western Washington students and parents of color to campus for an admission workshop, campus tours and light dinner before Cornel West's talk this September.
- Encouraging more students of color to become Overnight Hosts and Tour guides.
- Bringing to campus community organizations working with diverse student populations for events such as "A Midsummer Night's Dream" (including a pre-show talk for a group of thirty TRIO students with Geoff Proehl).
- Flying admitted students of color to campus on case-by-case basis if the students are unable to visit campus otherwise.
- Meeting with students of color college preparation organizations on campus and around the nation (Fulfillment Fund, One Voice, Daniel's Fund, Admission Possible, WEF Achiever's Program, Thurston Group).
- Attending area college fairs and workshops for students of color (coming up this winter: Thurston Group in Olympia and a Snohomish County Students of Color Day at Everett Community College, also Portland Hispanic College Fair, different Southern California students of color fairs, sending materials to LGBT College Fair on the East Coast).
- Representing Puget Sound and its offerings to regular WEF Achievers meetings, meeting on the road with Achievers site coordinators at its different high schools, and sending staff to review Achievers Scholarship applications. Puget Sound currently has 34 currently enrolled Achievers Scholars.
- Seeking deliberately a more diverse Office of Admission staff.
- Developing with the aid of a DSA summer intern a "Frequently Asked Questions about LGBT Life at Puget Sound" handout and web site; regularly referencing the recent Advocate Guide outcomes for LGBT-friendly colleges.

## Appendix C: Relevant Financial Aid Information

### Institutional scholarships and grants

	Students of Diversity		Entire Population	
	FR	Undergrad	FR	Undergrad
Total Awarded	\$2,042,000	\$7,476,000	\$6,090,000	\$20,895,000
Average per Student	\$16,700	\$15,600	\$16,000	\$14,600

### Puget Sound Opportunity Grant program (only awarded to students of diversity)

	'05-'06	'06-'07
Total Awarded	\$653,000	\$612,000
Average per Student	\$6,800	\$7,400

The Opportunity Grant program was established in 2005-06 to provide financial assistance to students who will contribute to the diversity of the student body. These students are defined as those from underrepresented populations and first generation college students.

- 198 students are currently receiving funding through the Opportunity Grant program
- \$1,363,802 was awarded through the Opportunity Grant program for the 2006-07 academic year; average award \$6,888; award range \$968 - \$18,000
- Yield on students offered financial assistance through the Opportunity Grant program:

	# offered	# enrolled	Yield	Average Yield on admitted freshman overall
<u>2005-06</u>	285	116	41%	22%
African American	61	21	34%	
American Indian	23	10	43%	
Asian	72	27	38%	
Hispanic	48	14	29%	
Native Hawaiian	9	1	11%	
<u>2006-07</u>	281	107	38%	22%
African American	55	26	47%	
American Indian	22	7	32%	
Asian	68	22	32%	
Hispanic	58	22	38%	
Native Hawaiian	6	3	50%	

*\*Note: This table does not include opportunity grant recipients who were first generation and not among targeted minority groups.*

2006-2007 Report  
Professional Standards Committee  
April 23, 2007

Members of the PSC for 2006-2007 were Kris Bartanen, Sigrun Bodine, Doug Cannon, Julian Edgoose, Karl Fields, Grace Kirchner, Don Share, and George Tomlin. Share was on leave during the spring. He chaired the committee during the fall and Kirchner took over as chair in the spring.

Over the course of the academic year, the PSC addressed the following topics:

Student Evaluations. We weighed in on several matters related to student evaluations. The memo to faculty on the administration of evaluations, which can be found appended to the minutes of September 11, was revised to emphasize the faculty member's responsibility to insure that evaluation are scheduled and administered with sufficient time for student response and to caution faculty about scheduling evaluations during the last day of class. In response to a query, we opined that it was acceptable for chairs to have access to teaching evaluations prior to the submission of grades if given permission by either the evaluatee or the Academic Dean (with subsequent notification of the evaluatee). The Committee also determined that it was acceptable to have teaching evaluations collected by students in the case of off-campus clinical courses in Physical Therapy as long as two students sign off on a form verifying that all procedures have been followed.

Evaluation Guidelines Revisions to the Politics and Government Guidelines pertaining to the Professor of Environmental Decision-making and Policy were approved. Revisions to the School of Education Evaluation Guidelines pertaining to the Director of Student Teaching and the role of instructors in evaluations were approved. The newly created guidelines for African American Studies were approved. The Department of Foreign Language and Literature was given feedback on its proposed revisions. Consideration of revisions to the guidelines for Communication Studies is pending as of this writing.

Code Interpretation on Early Tenure. At the meeting of February 12<sup>th</sup> the PSC passed an interpretation of the Faculty Code, the culmination of a discussion that occurred over several meetings.

“The expected times of tenure and promotion are framed by the Faculty Code (Chapter IV, Section 1, e and Section 2, b). This expected time may be further specified in the candidate's appointment letter (what the Faculty Code calls the “initial contract”). Early promotion or tenure refers only to situations where faculty members choose to apply for promotion or tenure earlier than this expected time.

In cases of early promotion or tenure, the “sustained record of achievement of exceptional merit in all the categories by which a faculty member is evaluated.” (Faculty Code Interpretation of Chapter IV, Section 2, b (4), February 9, 1987) is

interpreted to indicate a standard above and beyond that normally required for promotion and tenure.”

Revisions to Ch. 3, Sections 6 and 7 of the Faculty Code. The PSC continued work on this set of revisions carried over from last academic year, which pertain primarily to the appeals process. It was determined that the revisions would have the greatest likelihood of passing if the controversial items were dropped. The PSC agreed to take that approach, but also crafted revisions to address some newly discovered problems, such as the potential for a tie vote in a hearing board. The attached document, which was circulated to the faculty prior to the first reading on April 17, summarizes the proposed revisions. The second reading and vote on the revision package is scheduled to occur on May 1.

Other Faculty Code/Evaluation Matters. The PSC provided responses to several queries.

1. It is permissible for the FAC to consult materials from the immediately prior evaluation if such materials are contained in the evaluatee’s ongoing file.
2. Evaluatees who have open files can access the letters in their files both during the period for formal and informal challenges and after the FAC has completed its work on the file.
3. The Dean’s practice of accepting “late” requests for streamlined reviews from faculty members is not in violation of the Code.
4. There is no Code requirement that departmental deliberations regarding an evaluatee be kept confidential, but departmental guidelines can so specify.

**Summary of changes to the Code created by the proposed amendment to Ch. III, Sections 6 and 7, concerning procedures for appeals and hearings.**  
**April 9, 2007**

**The Motion:**

*The Professional Standards Committee proposes an amendment to the Faculty Code to strike the current language in Chapter III, sections 6 and 7, and to substitute the language in the previously submitted document in its place.*

*Adoption of this amendment shall authorize the modification of the Code citations so as to bring those citations into conformity with changes in the Code occasioned by the adoption of this amendment.*

**Overview of Substantive Changes:**

- (1) Language concerning the function of a hearing board is brought forward from later text (namely, section 7.e) to the preamble of s. 6.
- (2) The respondent on behalf of the department, school, or program, is designated and responsibilities of the respondent are clarified.
- (3) The time-line for a response is adjusted.
- (4) The hearing board roster is expanded to include the full faculty less exemptions for conflict of interest and absence of consent. The chance of a tied hearing board is reduced.
- (5) A repair is made to the current confused language about the path taken by the file after an appeal is concluded.

**Background:**

Since the implementation of major revisions to the Code in 2002, many questions have been raised regarding the hearing board/appeals process that is described in Ch. III, sections 6 and 7. Most of these questions reflect logical differences between levels of appeals (department/school/program versus Advancement Committee) that were not considered when the two separate levels were created.

Rather than develop a complex set of piecemeal amendments and interpretations, the 2005-06 PSC, with some input from the Faculty Senate, proposed a comprehensive revision of Ch. III, sections 6 and 7. The first reading of the amendment occurred at the Faculty Meeting on October 24, 2005. Amendments to the amendment were proposed, discussed, and voted on at subsequent meetings (12/6/05, 1/31/06, 3/6/06), but the revision as a whole was never acted upon. **This new revision attempts to capture the sentiment of those prior meetings by sidestepping those issues that seemed controversial in favor of correcting the problems that still exist in these sections.** Left unchanged are (1) the clause concerning confidentiality of the proceedings of a hearing board; (2) the authority and continued existence of a hearing board after



it has made its report; and (3) the question whether under the prevailing procedure (which provides for formal appeals at two levels) the process begins anew after a successful appeal, thereby permitting multiple appeals at the same level.

### **Substantive Changes by Sections:**

**Section 6.a.** has been reorganized to clarify differences between appeals at the two levels. Changes in content attempt to clarify grounds for appeals at the two levels (i.e., the department/school/program or the FAC), to define the identity of respondents at each level, and to specify processes by which respondents and dissenters formulate and transmit information. The revision also calls for the PSC chair, rather than the appellant, to deliver the list of alleged violations.

**Section 6.b.** includes changes to allow for a larger hearing board roster now that there can be appeals at two stages in the evaluation process. Also new is the exclusion of PSC members from the hearing board roster.

**Section 6.c.** includes more detail and some logistical changes to clarify processes used to form hearing boards and to allow for selection of three rather than one alternate. The section also bars individuals from serving on hearing boards at both levels for the same appellant. Additionally, the new language codifies the current practice of having the PSC chair or designate attend the first hearing board meeting. New language specifies that a new board is selected to conduct the hearing if any member resigns.

**Section 6.d.** has been revised to codify the current practice that the appellant and respondent are not present during the hearing board's discussion of probable cause. The changes also specify the appropriate recipients of reports regarding probable cause at each level and indicate that all appeal materials, including a hearing board decision regarding absence of probable cause, should be included in the file before it moves on. The new language also indicates that the chairpersons of the Faculty Senate and Professional Standards should be notified regarding the decision about probable cause, so that someone in an official capacity is kept apprised of the status of the process. The correct pathway for an evaluation file at each level is specified.

**Section 7** attempts to clarify the format of the hearing and the sequence and purpose of hearing board activities following a hearing, to specify who may and may not attend the hearing, and to describe processes through which dissenting opinions may be transmitted.

**Sections 7. j. and k.** specify parallel processes at the different levels if the hearing board finds that the code has been violated. Specifically, for appeals at the department, school, or program level, the hearing board has the option of either forwarding the file on to the FAC, or referring the matter back to the department, school, or program for correction of deficiencies. For appeals of FAC evaluations, the hearing board has the option of either forwarding the file on to the President, or referring the matter back to the FAC for correction of deficiencies.

**Sections 7. l.** specifies the correct pathway for an evaluation file at each level.

**Section 7.m.** clarifies which written materials from an appeal are added to the file and transmitted to the dean for retention. A new statement also indicates that the chairpersons of the Faculty Senate and PSC should be notified when the hearing board completes its work.