

**Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting
Monday, May 12, 2003**

Senators Present: *Kris Bartanen, Terry Cooney, Julian Edgoose, Bill Haltom, Kathie Hummel-Berry, Chris Kline, David Macey, Juli McGruder, Hans Ostrom, Karen Porter, David Tinsley, Alexa Tullis, Roberta Wilson*

Visitors Present: *Bill Barry, Terry Beck, Wade Hands, Carol Merz, Jac Royce*

Senate Chair *Hans Ostrom* called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m.

The minutes of the Senate meetings of April 21 and May 5 were approved without amendment.

Special Orders:

- *Alexa Tullis* reported a colleague's suggestion that elections be conducted online in order to save time and paper.
 - *Terry Cooney* noted that a change to electronic elections would require an amendment to the By-Laws, which require faculty members to sign their ballot envelopes.
- *Karen Porter* expressed the Senate's gratitude to *Hans Ostrom* for his leadership as Senate Chair this year and last.
 - The Senate expressed its appreciation with a standing ovation.
- *Hans Ostrom* reminded Senators of the party to be held at the Faculty Club following the conclusion of the Senate meeting.

"Carry-Over" Items:

Hans Ostrom presented the following list of unfinished business and items that will need to be monitored, including items that have been sent to the Board of Trustees:

1. Educational Benefits for same-sex partners of faculty members. Status: Unanimously endorsed by the Faculty Senate; endorsement and recommendation sent to President Pierce and the Board of Trustees.
2. Recommendations contained in the Final Report of the Study Abroad Task Force. Status: The Senate voted to receive the report but has not acted on or even fully discussed the recommendations yet. These probably need to be discussed and acted on early in the Fall semester, 2003.
3. Distribute organizational chart. Terry Cooney presented the chart to the Senate. The Senate may want to condense it and distribute it to the whole faculty.
4. Announce the ranking of candidates (by vote-total) in the most recent FAC election. This continues a practice begun in the early 1990s.
5. Discuss open files in tenure cases. This is an item from the Suggestion Box.
6. Discuss how the faculty might contribute to regular evaluations of the academic dean. The PSC sent a memo to the Senate in early May 2003 about this matter.
7. Continue to work with Karen Goldstein (Financial V.P.) on revisions of the four so-called "privacy" documents and the new weapons policy. Status: subcommittees of the Senate have revised these documents, which have received tacit approval from the Senate and which have

been forwarded to Karen Goldstein. The Faculty Senate needs to continue the process until revised policies appear on the University's website.

8. Discuss the restructuring of the Diversity Committee so that its membership is more similar to that of the other standing committees. Status: This was a charge to the Diversity Committee in 2002-2003.

9. Monitor status of the Student Bill of Rights. Status: ASUPS still has not acted on this issue.

10. Continue discussion of how the University welcomes and accommodates new faculty-members ("rookie camp"; how married faculty with children are treated; how unmarried faculty are treated; can the first year be made less stressful?; etc.) This is an item from the Suggestion Box.

11. Charge the Curriculum Committee with considering whether Veterans Day should be made a holiday on which the University does not hold classes. This is an item from the Suggestion Box, and the Senate has already provisionally, but not formally, endorsed the charge.

12. Suggest to the IRB that it meet more often. This should probably be discussed at the first or second Senate meeting of the Fall term. Status: Senator McGruder has written a charge.

13. Get an update from the Child Care Task Force.

14. Consider electronic voting in Senate, FAC, Senate Chair, and Salary Committee elections.

15. Charge the Diversity Committee with developing the equivalent of a "Diversity Impact Statement" that could be considered when the University makes decisions and sets policy that might not, at first glance, seem to affect diversity but that may affect it considerably later.

16. Insure that the change to the By Laws aimed at streamlining the evaluation system is put on the agenda for a full faculty meeting. This change was written by the PSC and approved by the Senate.

Carol Merz presented the following report on behalf of the **Academic Standards Committee**:

Item 1. Our first action item came from the Fall Faculty Conversation. We looked at ways of handling student petitions that would take less faculty time for routine matters. To this end we established a subcommittee of three staff members who would review petitions and approve those they were sure the Petitions Committee would approve. This subcommittee, fondly called The Triumvirate, operated all year. In April the ASC developed a system by which their work could be reviewed and authority delegated again each year. This procedure detailed in the minutes of 4/21/03 will be used next year.

Item 2. Our second order of business, requested by the Associate Deans' Office, was to amend the policy regarding proposal of study abroad programs. This amendment places more responsibility on the student making the proposal before it is reviewed by a faculty member. The approved change that will appear as an amendment to *The Logger*, p.75, appears below.

4. If the desired program is neither a Puget Sound affiliated nor approved program, the student may consult with a faculty member whose fields of expertise align with the central purpose of the desired program or of the student's prospective foreign study. The student should expect to do background work on the program and should be prepared to make a case in writing to the faculty member for adding the program to the University's approved list. If the faculty member concludes that he or she will recommend the addition of the program, the proposal may go forward with the

student's rationale for adding the program and a brief statement from the faculty member endorsing the request. A faculty member may also propose a program in her or his areas of expertise without a specific student request. Either a student or a faculty member may contact the Office of International Programs at any time for details about the process of proposing a new program. In all cases, proposals for adding a program to the approved list must be completed and approval granted before any student undertakes study in that program.

A. Upon receiving a positive recommendation from an appropriate faculty member and any accompanying materials, the director of International Programs will review the proposed program. The director may consult with appropriate department chairs or others knowledgeable about the quality of study abroad programs. The director will then make a recommendation for approval or non-approval to the associate dean, pointing out any particular strengths or concerns. Any foreign language or literature instruction course in the proposed study abroad program must have the approval of the foreign languages and literature department.

Item 3. On September 25 we voted to no longer require advisor approval for graduate registration. This change was made at the request of the School of Education where graduate students' courses of study are set and entering students are not usually assigned an advisor.

Item 4. (Senate Charge 3) In November we addressed a request from the Biology Department that majors taking Biology 392 not be charged an overload to take 4.5 units in the spring of their junior year as a basis for doing a senior thesis. The ASC recommended to Financial Services that the request be approved. Financial Services approved the request.

Item 5. (Senate Charge 4) In December we completed our charge from the Senate to establish a "gateway" policy to deal with students in the classes of 2004 and 2005 who may not have been able to take 100- level and 200-level gateway courses because they were caught between policy changes in registration priorities. The policy was approved by the Faculty Senate on January 27 and went to the full faculty on February 10. With no further action from the faculty, the "Gateway" policy went into effect.

Gateway Policy

Courses may be designed for students with specified characteristics such as class standing, major, or program that are fundamental to the academic objectives of the course. Some 100 level courses are designed primarily for freshmen, and all 100 and 200 level courses are normally constructed for lower-division students. Faculty may design such courses with an expectation that freshman and sophomores need different levels of guidance and different forms of challenge than juniors or seniors who are moving toward greater intellectual independence. However, certain of these courses may consistently be substantially filled with more advanced students because of the units-earned registration priority criterion. When such courses serve in part as gateway courses for a major or minor, lack of access for lower-division students may create obstacles to their beginning to meet major requirements in a timely way.

This Gateway Policy is designed to provide access to appropriate curricular opportunities for all students. Academic department chairs, program directors, and the Registrar will work together each semester to identify courses where student access to 100 level and gateway courses may be difficult, and they will allocate seats as necessary. This collaboration will occur early enough in the semester to allow sufficient time for the Registrar to publicize allocations in the schedule of classes.

To help monitor this policy, the Academic Standards Committee will consult at least annually with the Registrar and with the Director of Academic Advising to identify 100 and 200 level courses that appear not to be available to their intended freshman and sophomore student populations. The Committee will ask that department chairs, program directors, and the Registrar work together to manage better the allocation of seats for these courses. Likewise, the Academic Standards Committee shall consider whether there has been any negative impact of specified allocations on the academic progress of juniors and seniors in meeting core, major, or program requirements. The committee shall ask that department chairs, school directors, and the Registrar work together to accommodate the curricular needs of all students.

Item 6. (Senate Charge 1) In March the ASC passed a revision to Instances of Plagiarism and Other Acts of Academic Dishonesty, (*The Logger*, p.31-32). By this revision the ASC will appoint a member of the committee to be an ombudsperson to assist members of the faculty in investigating and charging a student with such acts. Use of the services of the ombudsperson will be optional and faculty will still be able to handle cases unassisted as in the past. The revised section appears below.

Response to Instances of Plagiarism and Other Acts of Academic Dishonesty

Introduction

Faculty are urged to review the definition of plagiarism with their classes, noting the specific steps that will be taken by the faculty member if an instance of plagiarism or other act of academic dishonesty is observed. (Throughout the remainder of this section the term "academic dishonesty" is used to include plagiarism and other acts of academic dishonesty). If a faculty member has reason to suspect academic dishonesty, the faculty member will take one of two courses of action: 1) handle the situation himself or herself as described in section 1 below, or 2) refer the case to the Academic Standards Committee ombudsperson as described in section 2 below.

1. If a faculty member has reason to suspect academic dishonesty, the following actions are taken if the faculty member elects to handle the situation himself or herself. (See section 2 for the alternative option of referring the case to the ombudsperson):

- a. The faculty member notifies the student that she or he suspects an instance of academic dishonesty and that an appropriate response will be made.
- b. The faculty member meets with the student as a part of the process of determining if an instance of academic dishonesty has occurred. This meeting can happen by phone or mail if the semester has ended or for other reasons the student is not available on campus. If the student is unreachable, then the faculty member determines responsibility based on the available evidence.
- c. If the faculty member determines that an instance of academic dishonesty has occurred, he or she submits to the Registrar an Academic Dishonesty Incident Report (available from the Office of the Registrar), including reasonable documentation and the recommended penalties to be imposed. The faculty member must provide a copy of the form to the student. The Registrar informs the faculty member if this is the student's first offense or not.
- d. If there has been no prior reported instance of academic dishonesty, the penalties imposed by the faculty member conclude the case unless either the student or the faculty member asks for a Hearing Board (see section 3 below).

2. The faculty member who suspects academic dishonesty may elect to enlist the help of the Academic Standards Committee's ombudsperson. The ombudsperson will assist with cases where the faculty member suspects dishonesty but is unsure about what happened, or in cases

where the faculty member is reluctant to address the issue with the student directly. In cases mediated by the ombudsperson, the following actions are taken:

- a. The faculty member notifies the student that she or he suspects an instance of academic dishonesty and that an appropriate response will be made.
- b. The faculty member contacts the ombudsperson. If it is likely that dishonesty did occur, the faculty member gives the ombudsperson a written statement of her or his suspicion and the facts as they are known, along with any supporting documentation and a recommended penalty if dishonesty is found to have occurred.
- c. The ombudsperson, either alone or in consultation with other member(s) of the Academic Standards Committee, meets with the student as a part of the process of determining if an instance of academic dishonesty has occurred. This meeting can happen by phone or mail if the semester has ended or for other reasons the student is not available on campus. If the student is unreachable, then the ombudsperson determines responsibility based on the available evidence.
- d. If the ombudsperson determines that an instance of academic dishonesty has occurred, he or she submits to the Registrar an Academic Dishonesty Incident Report (available from the Office of the Registrar), including the available documentation and the faculty member's recommended sanction. The ombudsperson will provide a copy of the form to the student. The Registrar informs the ombudsperson if this is the student's first offense or not.
- e. If there has been no prior reported instance of academic dishonesty, the recommended sanction(s) conclude the case unless either the student or the faculty member asks for a Hearing Board (see section 3 below).

3. If a previous act of academic dishonesty has been reported to the Office of the Registrar, the following actions are taken:

- a. The Registrar notifies the faculty member and/or the ombudsperson that at least one previous case has been reported.
- b. The Registrar asks that a Hearing Board be convened to consider the case and to apply appropriate sanctions (see Step 3 of the Hearing Board Procedures listed in the next section). The faculty member's proposed sanctions are forwarded to the board; however, depending on the gravity of the offense, the board may impose any of the sanctions described in Step 6 of the Hearing Board procedures listed below.

4. The Academic Dishonesty Incident Report forms are retained in a confidential file maintained by the Registrar only during the time of the student's enrollment at the University. Their purpose is to provide a record of instances of academic dishonesty in the event that any subsequent such reports are submitted. Contents of the Academic Dishonesty 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.

Item 7. (Senate Charge 5) On February 3 we took up the charge from the Senate to consider whether seminars lasting three hours could be scheduled before 3 pm as labs are. The Committee considered the request seriously but saw no way to lift the restriction. Long seminars mid-day cause too many problems in students' schedules and room scheduling. Labs are different because of designated rooms and multiple sections giving students many scheduling

options. The Committee reminds faculty that a faculty member may appeal to the Academic Dean's office for a special scheduling arrangement for reasons of academic merit.

Item 8. (Senate Charge 2) On March 24 the Committee completed the charge from the Senate to review emergency medical/administrative withdrawal. It was reported that the policy for emergency administrative withdrawal had not been used to date. The Committee however approved a policy as follows that allows a student who is not attending any classes to be withdrawn.

**REVISED VERSION OF "REGISTRATION AND ATTENDANCE/PARTICIPATION"
(Logger 2002-2003, page 69)**

[Beginning with the second paragraph of the section]

Regular class attendance is expected of all students. Absence from class for any reason does not excuse the student from completing all course assignments. An instructor who notes a significant pattern of absence on the part of a student should submit a Student Alert to the Academic Advising Office, which will contact and inform the student of the instructor's concerns. When non-attendance is in the instructor's judgment excessive, the instructor may levy a grade penalty or may direct the registrar to drop the student from the course.

Moreover, when non-attendance is excessive, as described in the preceding paragraph, in all of a student's academic courses, the student is considered to have voluntarily withdrawn from the university. The Registrar will then officially drop the student from all registered courses and will so inform the student. Once dropped from all courses, the student is required to leave campus. Students who are so disenrolled will normally receive "WF" grades. (See Withdrawal From a Course/From the University, Withdrawal Grades.)

Item 9 Over the year we discussed the final two Senate charges, examining the consequences of two advising items: first, students being able to drop/add courses without prior notification of their advisor, and second, students being required to have an advisor in the major. The Committee voted to postpone action on these issues until the Dean's ad hoc committee on Academic Advising has completed its work..

Item 10 The Committee also received four recommendations from the Retention Committee. In response to one of the recommendations, "that the faculty review the status and policies relating to reading period because reports by students and other members of the campus community suggest that at least some portion of students view reading period as a time for partying rather than studying," Dean Finney conducted a survey of faculty use of final exam week and found that 89% of all courses requires final exams or papers during final exam week. Because the value of reading period to students who use it properly outweighs problems caused by students who use it improperly, the committee made no changes to reading period policy.

The Retention committee also recommended "that the Academic Standards Committee revise its policies for students on academic warning or probation so that such students are required to meet either with someone in Academic Advising or with their faculty advisor to develop a plan for academic improvement." The committee, noting that this requirement is virtually already in place as an informal, *de facto* matter, deferred formal action on this recommendation until next year.

The Retention Committee asked that the faculty consider the concern "heard from students, faculty members and staff members that some students leave the University because they are not being challenged intellectually in their lower-level courses." The Committee discussed this

concern and concluded that an effective response that addressed the issue for the small number of students likely involved was beyond the scope of Committee resources this year.

Finally, The committee asked that “all faculty members participate in the early alert system. Because only twenty percent of the faculty currently do so, the committee believes that many students may not be receiving the timely help that might enable them to be academically successful.” The committee agreed this was an important issue and deferred consideration of formal action to ameliorate the situation until the Dean’s ad hoc committee on Academic Advising has completed its work.

Item 11 The committee discussed a concern over mid-term grades. It appears that fewer faculty are reporting mid-term grades and an increasing percentage of mid-term grades are missing. The committee shares this concern and considers mid-term grades to be an important way of alerting students to potential academic problems. The committee urges faculty to submit mid-term grades and recommends to next year’s committee that it take more formal steps to publicize this position to the University community.

Item 12 In April the School of Music submitted a request to waive tuition for certain students taking music lessons over the 4.25 academic limit. The committee was hesitant to forward the request to financial officers without more time to explore the financial and programmatic implications. This item will be returned to the School of Music with questions and suggestions for resubmission to next year’s committee.

Discussion of the Academic Standards Committee’s Report:

- *Bill Haltom* inquired as to the provenance of the *ad hoc* Committee on Retention.
 - *Terry Cooney* informed the Senate that the Committee on Retention was constituted by President Pierce in January of 2002 and consisted of staff members from various areas of the university. The committee heard testimony from various administrative departments about retention issues and issued a report indicating the overriding importance of financial aid considerations to students’ decisions to leave or remain at UPS.
- *Hans Ostrom* indicated that he had inquired about the possibility of faculty representation on the Committee on Retention.
 - *Terry Cooney* noted that five faculty members currently serve as members of the working group charged with reviewing the academic advising program at UPS and preparing a report for discussion by the full faculty.

The Senate voted unanimously to receive the report of the Academic Standards Committee.

Terry Beck presented the following report on behalf of the **Curriculum Committee**:

It has been a busy and challenging year for the Curriculum Committee. Members should be thanked for their industry and attentiveness to the business of the Committee. As is our practice, much of the Committee’s work is done by subcommittees. This year 13 faculty, 1 staff member, and 2 students served on 20 subcommittees.

Our work this year has focused primarily on the Senate charges. I address the charges in order.

- 1) We completed reviews for Education, Classics, Communication and Theatre Arts, the Honors program, Humanities and Comparative Sociology. Program reviews of Art and Asian Studies have been carried over to 2003-2004.
- 2) We assessed and revised the fallow year core procedures, eliminating the fallow year and reviewing the core on a 5-year cycle.
- 3) We kept on track with our conversion to the new core.

- 4) We affirmed the 5-year departmental review cycle.
- 5) We addressed concerns about thesis requirements for extra-departmental honors and, specifically, in the honors program.
- 6) We worked to balance ease of course approval with our charge to monitor the University's core curriculum.
- 7) We formulated a plan to request instructors to develop assessment plans and submit data.

In addition to attention to Senate charges, the Curriculum Committee revised and affirmed its deliberation and approval process, approved a new major in Science, Technology, and Society, and clarified Foreign Language requirement guidelines to allow American Sign Language (ASL) to meet University core and graduation requirements.

Attending to the campus-wide emphasis on saving faculty time and the need to advance the transition to the new core, the Curriculum Committee delegated to the Associate Dean one-year approval authority for courses proposed to the current core and approval authority for all "Approaches" courses proposed for the new core with the caveat that courses that did not clearly meet the guidelines would be considered by subcommittee.

The Curriculum Committee started considering the Asian Studies request to eliminate their major and minor and create a designation. We have discussed this request both as it is specific to Asian Studies and as it might impact other programs.

Charges from the Senate for next year could include:

1. Complete the 5-year review for Art and Asian Studies
2. Continue the on-going business of the Committee including the 5-year reviews for Business and Leadership, Economics, Environmental Studies, Exercise Science, Foreign Languages and Literature, International Political Economy, Music, Physical Education and Philosophy.
3. Consider a unit maximum on Special Interdisciplinary Majors (SIM)
4. Establish a schedule for rotation of core area reviews
5. Begin the implementation of the core assessment process

Curriculum Committee

Disposition of 2002-2003 Agenda

I. Departmental Reviews

12-5-2002	School of Education curriculum review approved.
12-5-2002	Classics Department curriculum review approved.
1-27-2003	Honors Program curriculum review approved.
2-10-2003	Humanities Program curriculum review approved.
3-10-2003	Comparative Sociology Department curriculum review approved.
4-21-2003	Communication Department curriculum review approved
4-28-2003	Theatre Department curriculum review approved

II. On-going business

Academic Calendar

10-34-2002	Academic Calendar for 2003-2004 and basic calendar for 2006-2007 approved and sent to Faculty Senate.
------------	---

Action on core courses

10-9-2002	CLSC 104, Cleopatra: History and Myth, approved for the Scholarly and Creative Inquiry seminar core
-----------	---

- 10-9-2002 HIST 125, Sightings: China in European and American Perception, approved for the Scholarly and Creative Inquiry seminar core)
- 10-9-2002 CSOC 115, Sex, Sexuality, and Commodification of the Human Body, approved for the Scholarly and Creative Inquiry seminar core
- 10-9-2002 HIST 122, Ecotopia: Landscape and Identity in the Pacific Northwest, approved for the Scholarly and Creative Inquiry seminar core
- 10-9-2002 PHYS 103, The Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence, approved for the Scholarly and Creative Inquiry seminar core
- 10-9-2002 FL 115, The Problem of Theodicy, approved for the Scholarly and Creative Inquiry seminar core
- 10-9-2002 FL 125, The Quest for King Arthur, approved for the Scholarly and Creative Inquiry seminar core
- 10-9-2002 HIST 123, The Second World War in Europe, approved for the Scholarly and Creative Inquiry seminar core
- 10-9-2002 PHIL 107, Making Choices about the Environment, approved for the Scholarly and Creative Inquiry seminar core
- 10-9-2002 PHIL 108, Infinity and Paradox, approved for the Scholarly and Creative Inquiry seminar core
- 10-9-2002 CSOC 120, Social Order and Human Freedom, approved for the Scholarly and Creative Inquiry seminar core
- 10-9-2002 HON 150, History and the Construction of the Other, approved for the Scholarly and Creative Inquiry seminar core
- 10-9-2002 REL 111, Joan of Arc, approved for the Scholarly and Creative Inquiry seminar core
- 10-9-2002 MATH 133, The Art and Science of Secret Writing, approved for the Scholarly and Creative Inquiry seminar core
- 10-9-2002 HUM 120, Culture and Crisis, approved for the Scholarly and Creative Inquiry seminar core
- 10-9-2002 FL 150, Film and Memory: The Imagination of Disaster, approved for the Scholarly and Creative Inquiry seminar core
- 10-9-2002 MUS 120, Pop Music and Its Context, approved for the Scholarly and Creative Inquiry seminar core
- 10-9-2002 PSYC 145, Ethical Issues in Clinical Psychology, approved for the Scholarly and Creative Inquiry seminar core
- 10-9-2002 PHYS 102, A Brief History of Time: A Look at Hawking's Universe, approved for the Scholarly and Creative Inquiry seminar core

- 10-9-2002 CSOC 125, Culture Wars: A Global Context, approved for the Scholarly and Creative Inquiry seminar core
- 10-9-2002 HIST 111, Scholars and Warriors in China and Japan, approved for Writing and Rhetoric seminar core
- 10-9-2002 ENGL 125, Civic Argument and the Theatre of Democracy, approved for Writing and Rhetoric seminar core
- 10-9-2002 COMM 106, Science and Equality, approved for Writing and Rhetoric seminar core
- 10-9-2002 HUM 121, Arms and Men: The Rhetoric of Warfare, approved for Writing and Rhetoric seminar core
- 10-9-2002 ENGL 122, Seeing Texts and Writing Contexts, approved for Writing and Rhetoric seminar core
- 10-9-2002 ENGL 123, Individual Rights and the Common Good, approved for Writing and Rhetoric seminar core
- 10-9-2002 COMM 102, Social Scientific Argumentation, approved for Writing and Rhetoric seminar core
- 10-9-2002 ENGL 124, See What I Mean? Words and Images, approved for Writing and Rhetoric seminar core
- 10-24-2002 HUM 122, Utopia/Dystopia, approved for the Scholarly and Creative Inquiry seminar core
- 10-24-2002 LAS 111, Salsa, Samba, and Soccer, approved for the Scholarly and Creative Inquiry seminar core
- 10-24-2002 ECON 101, Industrial Economics and Sustainability, approved for the Scholarly and Creative Inquiry seminar core
- 10-24-2002 ART 160, Chinese Painting in the West, approved for the Scholarly and Creative Inquiry seminar core
- 10-24-2002 BIOL 160, The Broken Brain, approved for the Scholarly and Creative Inquiry seminar core
- 10-24-2002 STS 121, Evolution and Creationism in the US, approved for the Scholarly and Creative Inquiry seminar core
- 10-24-2002 PG 111, The Constitution in Crisis Times, approved for the Scholarly and Creative Inquiry seminar core
- 10-24-2002 CSOC 123, Modernization and Social Change in Southeast Asia, , approved for the Scholarly and Creative Inquiry seminar core
- 10-24-2002 PHIL 109, Religion in Philosophy and Literature, approved for the Scholarly and Creative Inquiry seminar core
- 10-24-2002 ENGL 121, Trauma and Memory, approved for Writing and Rhetoric seminar core

- 10-24-2002 BIOL 150, Science in the News, approved for Writing and Rhetoric seminar core
- 10-24-2002 COMM 103, Rhetoric of Adventure, approved for Writing and Rhetoric seminar core
- 10-24-2002 ENGL 120, Ideas and Arguments on Stage, approved for Writing and Rhetoric seminar core
- 12-5-2002 THTR 111, Making Musical Theatre, approved for Scholarly and Creative Inquiry seminar core
- 12-5-2002 ECON 103, Varieties of Social Explanation, approved for Scholarly and Creative Inquiry seminar core
- 12-5-2002 ENGL 127, An Opinion about Everything, approved for Writing and Rhetoric seminar core
- 12-5-2002 ENGL 126, Genre Studies in Literature, approved for Writing and Rhetoric seminar core
- 12-5-2002 CSOC 121, African Families and the Politics of Culture, approved for Writing and Rhetoric seminar core
- 12-5-2002 ENGL 128, Shaping the Shadow: Argument and Insight, approved for Writing and Rhetoric seminar core
- 1-27-2003 PHIL 104, Freedom on the Will and the Concept of a Person, approved for the Scholarly and Creative Inquiry seminar core
- 1-27-2003 PHIL 105, Democracy and Equality, approved for the Scholarly and Creative Inquiry seminar core
- 1-27-2003 PT 110, Analyzing Health Care, approved for the Scholarly and Creative Inquiry seminar core
- 1-27-2003 ENGL 130, Print Culture, Literacy, and Argument in American Life, approved for Writing and Rhetoric seminar core
- 1-27-2003 ENGL 129, Power and Perception: The Music and the Mirror, approved for Writing and Rhetoric seminar core
- 1-27-2003 ECON 102, Controversies in Contemporary Economics, approved for Writing and Rhetoric seminar core
- 2-10-2003 CTA 107, Rhetoric, Film, and National Identity, approved for Writing and Rhetoric seminar core
- 2-10-2003 HON 101, Encountering the Other/Writing the Self, approved for Writing and Rhetoric seminar core
- 2-10-2003 GEOL 111, Dinosaurs and the Worlds They Lived In, approved for Scholarly and Creative Inquiry seminar core

- 3-10-2003 ENGL 131, Three Big Questions, approved for Writing and Rhetoric seminar core
- 3-10-2003 HUM 310, Postmodernism and Japanese Mass Culture, approved for the Connections core
- 3-10-2003 FL 375, Narrating the Nation: Japanese Literature and Modern Identity, approved for the Connections core
- 3-10-2003 COMM 340, Gender and Communication, approved for the Connections core
- 3-31-2003 ENGL 132, Ecology of the Text, approved for Writing and Rhetoric seminar core
- 4-7-2003 PG 131, Islam and its Contexts, approved for Scholarly and Creative Inquiry seminar core
- 4-21-2003 ENGL 133, Politics of Space, Public and Private, approved for Writing and Rhetoric seminar core
- 4-28-2003 CSOC 48, Informed Seeing, approved for Connections core
- 4-28-2003 HUM 307, Shanghai and Tokyo in the 1920s, approved for Connections core

III. Other Curricular Business

- 9-12-2002 Approved the continuation of the current authority delegated to the Associate Dean and the addition of the following:
- a. The Curriculum Committee delegates to the Associate Dean approval authority during the 2002-2003 academic year for all courses proposed for the current core. The Associate Dean will refer to the appropriate Curriculum Committee Subcommittee all courses that he believes may not or do not meet current core guidelines.
 - b. The Curriculum Committee delegates to the Associate Dean approval authority for all "Approaches" courses proposed for the new core, effective Fall 2003. The Associate Dean will refer to the appropriate Curriculum Committee Subcommittee all courses that he believes may not or do not meet the new core guidelines.
- 10-3-2002 Approved listing the first year seminars under a separate category such as "WR" and "SCIS" in the Bulletin. (Later overturned by the Faculty Senate.)
- 10-3-2002 Affirmed subcommittee/committee deliberation and approval process.
- 10-9-2002 Approved deferral of Business curriculum review to 2003-2004.

- 10-24-2002 Approved deferral of Environmental Studies curriculum review to 2003-2004.
- 10-24-2002 Approved deferral of Economics curriculum review to 2003-2004.
- 10-24-2002 Approved deferral of Asian Studies curriculum review to 2003-2004.
- 10-24-2002 Approved a Fall version of the ILACA Study Abroad program in Granada, Spain.
- 2-3-2003 Approved Science, Technology, and Society Program.
- 2-10-2003 Approved deferral of Religion curriculum review until October 2004.
- 3-31-2003 Special Interdisciplinary Major in Biochemistry approved for Kelli Kline.
- 4-7-2003 Approved the following in regard to American Sign Language
- a. The Curriculum Committee directs the University Registrar to approve the following as satisfying the CommIIB core: two successfully-completed college-level semester courses of ASL, provided the courses in question (1) aim to develop proficiency in ASL (with a special emphasis on signing and comprehension) and (2) satisfy sections III and IV of the Comm IIB guidelines.
 - b. The Curriculum Committee directs the University Registrar to approve the following as satisfying Graduation Requirement G of the Curriculum Statement effective 03/04: (1) two successfully-completed college-level semester courses of ASL at the first-year level or one semester college-level course of ASL at the second-year level or above or (2) passing an ASL proficiency exam at the third-year high school or first-year college level.
- 4-21-2003 Approved an extension to beginning of Spring tem 2004 of the deferral granted to Business and Leadership
- 4-28-2003 Approved interpretations of the terms used in the wording of the Foreign Language requirement
- 4-28-2003 Approved changes to Curriculum Committee procedures: core reviews will be spread over a four year period with a fifth year devoted to overall coherence and/or appropriateness of the core categories; department reviews will be spread over a five year period, with the "fallow year" being eliminated.

IV. Business to be carried over to 2003-2004

Art Department Curriculum Review
Asian Studies Curriculum Review

V. Departmental reviews scheduled for 2003-2004

Business and Leadership
Comparative Sociology
Economics
Environmental Studies
Exercise Science
Foreign Languages and Literature
International Political Economy

Music
Physical Education
Philosophy

Discussion of the Curriculum Committee's Report:

- *Juli McGruder* asked whether Physical Education will be subject to a five-year review, even though it is no longer a major.
 - *Terry Cooney* indicated that Physical Education could be the subject of review as a program offering activity credits rather than as a major.
- *Julian Edgoose* asked whether the current, thirteen-member Curriculum Committee is large enough to complete the work assigned to it.
 - *Terry Beck* indicated that a bigger committee might prove unwieldy but that additional members might help the committee to complete some of the work that it does in its many subcommittees.
- *Bill Haltom* asked whether Communication Studies and Theater Arts were reviewed together or separately 2002-03 academic year.
 - *Terry Beck* responded that the programs were reviewed separately, in anticipation of CTA's division into two separate departments.
- *Hans Ostrom* asked what action the Curriculum Committee took in response to the Senate's and the faculty's concern over extra-departmental theses.
 - *Bill Barry* indicated that the Curriculum Committee discussed this issue with the Honors Program and that the Honors Program is developing an informal screening process to insure that only students capable of writing theses undertake them.
 - *Hans Ostrom* suggested that the thesis requirement might be eliminated for Coolidge Otis Chapman Honors Scholars so as to reduce pressure on faculty members to undertake the supervision of unqualified students eager for this honor.

The Senate voted unanimously to receive the report of the Curriculum Committee.

Jac Royce presented the following report on behalf of the **Diversity Committee**:

Overview:

The committee began the year with six charges from the Faculty Senate. This report discusses each of these charges. Since our work on these charges has led us to develop ideas about the future efforts of the committee, we end this report with a group of suggested standing responsibilities, as well as a group of suggested charges specific to 2003-2004.

The University Diversity Committee focused its 2002-2003 work on assessing the present state of the campus climate, the current successes and frustrations of those groups charged with building and supporting diversity, and the potential of the committee to become more proactive. We held in-depth discussions with Admissions, Disability Services, Access Programs, and Human Resources, and we began a series of meetings with student groups. In addition to the information presented in each of these sessions, the committee has received scores of specific and general recommendations and requests. In the coming year, we intend to continue these meetings, to assist these groups in their efforts, and to begin acting on some of these suggestions ourselves. Our research and actions in the 2002-2003 and 2003-2004 academic years will also enable us to fulfill our charge to consider benchmarks for recruitment and retention of faculty, staff, and students from under-represented groups, and to suggest how these benchmarks might be met.

2002-2003 Charges:

1. Continue to work with the office of Admission staff on ways to evaluate and regularize the telephoning project.

We began by speaking with current Puget Sound students who had been contacted through the project, as well as discussing the outcome of the previous year's phoning with the Office of Admission. A subcommittee headed by Eric Orlin reevaluated the timing and the approach. In an effort to enable potential students to be personally contacted by Puget Sound faculty active in areas of study in which the students had indicated an interest, most contacts were made by email this year. The use of email widened the available pool of faculty, also making it possible to contact more students. In addition, we hoped that the use of email would lessen the feeling of pressure reported by some students.

It is too early to assess the outcome of this year's faculty contact with potential students. The committee can make that information available in fall if the Faculty Senate so requests.

The committee feels that this charge should become a standing charge.

2. Continue to work with the Director of Access Programs and the faculty support committee to collaborate with Access Programs and the Speakers' Bureau.

Kim Bobby made an extensive presentation, bringing the committee up-to-date on the work and progress of Access Programs. Some members of the committee are personally active in Access Programs, and Bobby has made many suggestions of ways in which the committee and other members of the university community can become involved. In addition, Access Programs and the Diversity Committee are eager to discuss Trinity College's POSSE program with incoming president Ron Thomas.

The committee feels that this charge should become a standing charge.

3. Present a revised draft of the University Statement on Diversity to the Senate during the fall 2002 semester and facilitate University-wide deliberation regarding the statement.

The revised statement was taken forward and subsequently endorsed by the faculty, staff, and student senates. The Academic and Student Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees approved the statement in February. The text follows:

~~~~~

#### University Diversity Statement

##### We Acknowledge

- \* the richness of commonalities and differences we share as a university community.
- \* the intrinsic worth of all who work and study here.
- \* that education is enhanced by investigation of and reflection upon multiple perspectives.

##### We Aspire

- \* to create respect for and appreciation of all persons as a key characteristic of our campus community.
- \* to increase the diversity of all parts of our University community through commitment to diversity in our recruitment and retention efforts.
- \* to foster a spirit of openness to active engagement among all members of our campus community.

##### We Act

- \* to achieve an environment that welcomes and supports diversity.
- \* to insure full educational opportunity for all who teach and learn here.
- \* to prepare effectively citizen-leaders for a pluralistic world.

~~~~~

The statement has been posted on the university website and will be printed in the upcoming Bulletin, Logger, and Viewbook. The Diversity Committee and the Dean of Students Office co-sponsored a poster design contest; the winning concept is being further developed. In addition, subcommittees meeting with student groups have used the statement to begin conversations about campus diversity issues and goals.

The committee recommends continued work to publicize the Diversity Statement as a charge for 2003-2004.

4. Work with appropriate offices and governing bodies to monitor and support disability as an aspect of diversity.

The committee noted that many members of the Deaf community object to the classification of deafness as a 'disability' and, therefore, agreed to make more conscious use of the phrase "disability/difference" in place of the term "disability" alone.

The committee co-sponsored with the Office of Disability Services a film series to raise awareness of issues of disability and difference. In another education-related undertaking, the committee participated in the deliberation about American Sign Language and core curriculum requirements. In this case, two committee members with backgrounds in linguistics reported on spatial languages in general and ASL in particular to the subcommittee of the Curriculum Committee charged with making a recommendation.

The committee feels that this charge should become a standing charge.

5. Consider 5, 10, 15, and 20-year benchmarks for both recruitment and retention of different groups of students, faculty, administrators, and staff of color.

The committee devoted several meetings to learning about Puget Sound's recruitment and retention efforts. We examined studies and statistics provided by Randy Nelson that included comparisons with similar institutions. Admissions staff made two presentations about their work, the kinds of challenges they meet, and suggestions of ways in which the committee and the University in general could help them. The committee continued discussions with Human Resources begun during 2001-2002 about the recruiting and retention of faculty and staff of color. In addition, subcommittees began a series of meetings with student groups in which recruitment and retention of students of diverse backgrounds were subjects of conversation.

The committee hopes to continue this work during 2003-2004 and, if possible, to suggest benchmarks in the report to the Faculty Senate in May 2004, as well as some strategies for achieving these benchmarks.

6. Consider the appropriateness of recommending to the Senate a By-Laws change that would eliminate some of the administrative membership on the committee. [The Diversity Committee has more administrative members than other standing committees do.]

At our first meeting in September 2002, the committee noted that it is designated as the "University Diversity Committee"-that is, not a 'faculty' committee, but a committee meant to have a broader membership of faculty, administrators, staff, and students. Each administrative member represents a campus department with a vested interest in diversity. We find this membership vital and appropriate.

The charge led the committee to focus on its status as a 'university' committee, both in terms of function and of membership. In researching the By-Laws, the committee learned that in fact not

all of its staff seats were filled. When Chair Jac Royce went to the Staff Senate to seek additional staff appointments, two members of the Staff Senate volunteered to serve on the Diversity Committee, including Institutional Research Director Randy Nelson. We have developed plans for making it easier for students and staff members to serve on the committee, recognizing that better staff and student participation will help to publicize the presence and work of the committee. In addition, we spent much of the year gathering information about ways in which the committee could take a more active and public role in supporting the efforts of the many campus groups dedicated to the diversity of the University community.

Proposed Charges

We propose that the Faculty Senate approve two sets of charges, as follows:

Standing Charges:

1. Work with the Office of Admission to support its recruitment efforts, including facilitation of the (so-called) telephoning project.
2. Work with the Director of Access Programs and the faculty support committee to collaborate with Access Programs and the Speakers' Bureau.
3. Work with appropriate offices and governing bodies to monitor and support disability/difference as an aspect of diversity.

Charges for 2003-2004:

1. Facilitate campus-wide discussion of the University Diversity Statement and seek additional ways to publicize both the statement itself and the commitment of the campus to the philosophy and goals identified therein.
2. Continue the work begun during 2002-2003 to consider 5, 10, 15, and 20-year benchmarks for both recruitment and retention of students, faculty, administrators, and staff of color.
3. Continue discussions with Student Diversity Center organizations and initiate similar discussions with residential student groups to gain insight into the current campus climate and to hear students' recommendations for improvement, as well as students' perspectives on the role the Diversity Committee might play on campus.
4. Consider active roles that the committee might take in support of those campus organizations whose goals focus specifically on supporting diversity, including Admissions, Student Diversity Center and its affiliated groups, the Race and Pedagogy discussants, Multicultural Student Services, and Disability Services.
5. Offer feedback on recommendations forthcoming from the Campus Harassment Policy Work Group for revisions to the Sexual Harassment Policy that would make it a comprehensive anti-discrimination and harassment policy.
6. Consider ways in which to promote interaction between the campus and the Tacoma community and to build stronger relationships with other campuses in the area, partly to combat the isolation felt by students of color and aid in retention, and partly to assist in recruitment of local students and staff.

Discussion of the Diversity Committee's Report:

- *Bill Haltom* noted that the Diversity Committee's argument to maintain a large committee with many administrative, student, and staff members, is persuasive to the extent that a large membership could provide the committee with extensive and valuable contacts throughout the university community, but he also noted that a large membership could also impede the committee's efforts to promote and sustain diversity by bringing more special interests to the table, some of which interests might be conflict with the committee's goals.
 - *Jac Royce* observed that this has not been the case this year, as the committee's many members have been strongly supportive of initiatives to increase diversity on campus.

- *Alexa Tullis* asked whether the committee had considered the contributions that older and returning students make to diversity on campus.
 - *Jac Royce* responded that the committee did discuss the contributions of older and returning students and noted that the move toward a more residential campus community had had an adverse impact on this and other forms of diversity at UPS.
 - *Terry Cooney* noted that the residential student profile at UPS did not change significantly from the 1970s until the completion of Trimble Hall, but that the number of older and local students has diminished during.
- *Juli McGruder* noted that the university never makes policies *against* diversity but that it does not reflect on the inadvertent consequences that its policy decisions may have on campus diversity. How, for example, will the new first-year Core requirements affect transfer students from community colleges, who contribute significantly to on-campus diversity? Perhaps, *McGruder* suggested, the committee might take as one of its charges the review of new university policies to assess their possible impact on campus diversity.
- *Jac Royce* noted that the diminishing number of transfer students has had a perceptibly negative effect on diversity on campus.
 - *Terry Cooney* correlated the decline in the number of transfer students to increased retention of first-year students.
- *David Tinsley* noted that increasing tuition has also had a serious effect on diversity on campus.
 - *Roberta Wilson* concurred, noting that tuition increases are particularly hard on returning students, who often work full-time to finance their educations.
 - *Juli McGruder* pointed out that even in Occupational and Physical Therapy, programs that have historically had large numbers of older and returning students, the number of older and returning students is diminishing, in large part because of increased tuition charges at UPS.

The Senate voted unanimously to receive the report of the Diversity Committee.

Terry Cooney presented the following report on behalf of the **Faculty Advancement Committee**:

During 2002-2003 the Faculty Advancement Committee undertook reviews of approximately fifty evaluation files. Completing these review processes is the central task of the committee, and we fully expect to accomplish this work (albeit with no room to spare).

Before engaging in its own deliberation on the files, the committee examined whether each one demonstrated that the departmental process had met the procedural and substantive requirements of the faculty Code and of the pertinent department statement. The current cycle of reviews produced more instances than usual in which the committee found that some element of the departmental process needed attention before discussion of the file could proceed. As the University moves to new Code language after this semester, the Advancement Committee will encourage head officers to pay special heed to the language of the Code and of their own departmental statements as they work with colleagues to ensure a fair and adequate evaluation process. All faculty participating in evaluation must also share a portion of the responsibility for making class visits, for writing letters of evaluation before published deadlines, and for respecting the process as defined in the Code and departmental statements.

The interpretation of the Code on letters of evaluation (developed by the Professional Standards Committee and approved by the Board of Trustees) has provide clear guidelines for all to review. Although there may still be times when a faculty member or a colleague outside the University seeks to add a letter after the deadline for a file has passed, the guidelines have made it a straightforward matter, in most cases, for the committee to determine whether letters may be made part of the written record that is the basis for review.

In response to a question from *Bill Haltom*, *Terry Cooney* explained that an evaluatee may include any letter he or she wishes in his or her evaluation file, that UPS faculty members may submit their letters

either to the relevant department head or to the Dean, and that persons from outside the university must direct their letters to the department head.

The Senate voted unanimously to accept the report of the Faculty Advancement Committee.

Wade Hands presented the following report on behalf of the **Professional Standards Committee**:

The following report summarizes the activities of the Professional Standards Committee during the 2002-03 academic year.

1. The PSC approved two departmental statements on Evaluation Criteria, Procedures, and Guidelines remaining from the previous year (Exercise Science and C&TA).
2. The PSC responded to four charges from the Faculty Senate:
 - a) Prepared a detailed report on the "Four Written Confidentiality Policies." (initial report on 11/25/02 and supplemental response on 12/4/03)
 - b) Reviewed and reported on the proposed amendment to the university's alcohol and drug policy. (report 12/2/02)
 - c) Prepared a detailed report on ways to streamline the faculty evaluation process. (report 4/7/03)
 - d) Responded to the request to consider ways that the faculty might contribute regularly to the evaluation of the Dean. (report 5/5/03)

Time did not permit the committee to act on the Senate's fifth initial charge (to review the Instructor Evaluation Form).

3. The PSC also reviewed and approved five requests from the Dean's Office:
 - a) Clarification of the administration of instructor course evaluations.
 - b) Revision of the Faculty Recruitment Guideline Documents for clarity and to reflect changes in the Faculty Code.
 - c) Statement on extended faculty absences.
 - d) Clarification of the term "working days" in the Faculty Code.
 - e) Clarification of what constitutes a "signed letter" in the context of the faculty evaluation process.
4. Finally, the PSC responded to two departmental requests regarding informal interpretations of the Faculty Code (Biology and C&TA); considered one request to modify an existing departmental statement (Psychology); and dealt with one confidential matter.

The Senate voted unanimously to accept the report of the Professional Standards Committee.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

These minutes are respectfully submitted by J. David Macey, Jr.