

University of Puget Sound 2010-11 Faculty Senate

MINUTES

May 2, 2011, 4:00-5:30, Misner Room

Senators Present: Tiffany Aldrich MacBain, Kris Bartanen, Mike Segawa, Elise Richman, Ross Singleton, Fred Hamel, Keith Ward, Rob Hutchinson, Kristin Johnson, Brad Dillman, Bill Barry, Savannah LaFerrière, Marcus Luther, and Dan Burgard

Guests present: Jennifer Utrata, Bruce Mann, Nitai Deitel, John Hanson, Kate Stirling, Tedra Hamel, Liz Collins, Derek Buescher, Alyce DeMarais, and Mark Reinitz.

- I. Call to order
Neshyba called the meeting to order at 4:01PM
- II. Approval of minutes of April 18, 2011
Moved (Hamel)/S/P to approve minutes. Minor additions/correction from Neshyba and Amy Ryken (via email) were included and the minutes were approved.
- III. Announcements
The Senate thanks Lisa Johnson for her service on the Senate.
Neshyba informed that his daughter, Catherine Neshyba, took first place in the State music competition. He added that Hamel's son, Will Hamel, with Ward's son, Benjamin Ward, took first place in the state music competition with a piece composed by Rob Hutchinson. Will Hamel also won first place in the state poetry contest.
- IV. Special Orders (1-minute concerns)
Neshyba announced that President Thomas will convene a meeting at 4PM on 5/4/2011 about the NIC tuition exchange and retirement policies.
- V. Closed-session consideration of Commencement Speaker candidates for honorary degrees (John Hanson, Kate Stirling, Liz Collins, Nitai Deitel, Teddi Hamel)
The list of nominees for 2012 was approved by the Senate.
- VI. **Moved (Ward)/S/P** to receive the year-end report from the University Enrichment Committee (UEC) (See Attachment A).
Utrata gave a brief overview of the report.
Hamel asked whether the P-card (Purchase card) does away with the UEC professional travel category caps.
Utrata said the P-card allows for a total amount used rather than dollars per cap, and that caps don't encourage people to report actual expenses which are often beyond what is supported by UEC. This means that under the P-Card system the UEC doesn't necessarily know how the money is allocated or how to better appropriate the funds.
Ward mentioned that the Music department uses P-cards.
Bartanen noted that the P-card system rebates dollars to the university, amounting to a significant return.
Hutchinson asked if receipts still need to be turned in with the P-card system and Ward said yes.

Luther asked if there were student representatives on the UEC.

Utrata said that the UEC meeting schedule has made it difficult for students to attend.

Hamel asked if P-cards were individual or departmental, and Bartanen answered that they are individual.

Neshyba asked how often the UEC met and if there were enough faculty representatives on it.

Utrata said that the UEC met every other week with sub-committees meeting more often and that she believed there to be enough faculty.

Report received.

VII. Moved (Hamel)/S/P to receive the year-end report from the Curriculum Committee (see Attachment B).

Buescher gave a brief overview of the report and began fielding questions.

Dillman asked about the reoccurring question of the fall and spring semesters being the same number of days on the next calendar.

Buescher replied that it didn't really come up this year.

Luther inquired about the status of the diversity core.

Buescher responded that the standing question is, "What does diversity mean?" Buescher said that the committee needs to work more closely with the Committee on Diversity and Chief Diversity Officer.

MacBain asked what "aspirational" diversity means in the report.

Buescher said there was discussion about making "suggested" classes that include diversity.

MacBain asked if the list of suggested courses was a first step towards a Diversity core.

Buescher said he thought that any step toward a new core would take quite a while.

Hamel noted that when he visited Whitman as a perspective parent he saw that that school makes emphasizes diversity in its curriculum.

Buescher responded that Whitman's president did spend significant time discussing diversity.

Buescher finished by thanking Alyce DeMarais and Bob Matthews.

Utrata added that the UEC thanks Sarah Moore and Peter Greenfield.

Report received.

VIII. Moved/S/P to receive year-end report from the Student Life Committee (SLC) (see Attachment C).

Mann thanked Segawa and the SLC's four, actively engaged students for all their hard work on the committee.

Mann highlighted major parts of the report such as:

- the fact that hard drug use is not a major concern; marijuana use seems to have gone up, perhaps due to better reporting of its use rather than to more of it being used;
- the discussion of how to attain a higher on-campus residency rate (75-80%) and the success of the residential seminar program;
- the concern with increasing support for sophomores;
- the change in academic integrity issues: lapses do not appear to be malicious; plagiarism seems mostly "inadvertent."

Luther asked if Mann thought the same students should continue on the committee next year, and Mann said "yes."

Hamel asked for the overall percentage of students living on-campus. Segawa responded that we are currently at 60% and that the additional 15-20% required by the master plan would not be made up in one residence hall; the 75-80% is a long-term goal.

Ward asked if the 60% figure included the study-abroad students.

Segawa responded that the number that gives us 60% is based on students living on campus in the fall.

Bartanen added that there are about 50 more students studying abroad in spring than fall but that those students are not all on-campus.

MacBain asked about the function of the "Green Dot" program and also asked for an explanation for why marijuana use might be going up.

Segawa responded that the numbers may be going up in general since the numbers for middle school/high school are also going up.

Barry asked if an actual percentage was known for student drug use.

Segawa responded that the reporting is not based on the number of students but is arrived at from incident reports and national surveys

Barry asked if Segawa thought usage was over 50% and Segawa responded that it probably was not.

Neshyba asked if turnitin.com has made a difference in plagiarism on campus.

DeMarais said that more faculty are using the website as a part of the educational/revision process rather than for punitive reasons.

MacBain noted that she has had more luck with Google searches than with turnitin but that, even so, both programs fail to identify papers that have been purchased.

Segawa noted that although plagiarism is a Student Life concern, the committee is not the driving force or a primary player in this issue.

Hamel said he was trying to get a fix on the sophomore "campus life issues." He asked if it is a decrease in "pampering" as Mann orally noted.

Segawa responded that a survey in the fall showed that time-management, students being closer to declaring major, moves off campus (and the fewer supported programs attendant to that move) were the bigger issues.

Mann closed by saying that the sophomores on the committee feel incredibly academically engaged.

Report received.

IX. Moved (MacBain)/S/P to receive the year-end report from Library, Media, and Information Systems Committee (LMIS) (see Attachment D).

Reinitz began by saying that the report shows that all charges were addressed. He added that his impressions of William Morse and Cindy Riche are that they are very concerned about making sure the faculty is onboard before they make any changes and are very diligent in soliciting faculty ideas. Reinitz also added that Jane Carlin is very good at communicating Library issues to the committee.

Reinitz mentioned that it took Morse very little time to convince the committee that the current ERP (Enterprise Resource Program) was behind and that a new one was needed. Reinitz noted that the 3 major charges to the committee were:

1) *to develop and implement a print management program*: he noted that no vendor has been chosen yet but that next semester printing quantities will be monitored;

2) *to review copyright policy*: he noted that this policy was hard to set since copyright laws change rapidly. Ward noted that the TEACH ACT requires universities to have a

copyright policy. Reinitz responded, “Yes, we have a policy but trying to update it is tough; it’s a moving target.”

3) *Intellectual property policy*: Reinitz commented that Puget Sound’s policy seems unusually generous to faculty and students in comparison to other universities. The policy is going to the school lawyers and will eventually reach the Faculty Senate. Dillman noted that there are major legal issues with intellectual property and asked if the committee really knows what is fair and equitable in legal terms. Reinitz responded that Morse, a J.D., seemed to be very up front with the policy and there was much conversation about word usage. Dillman responded that he still doesn’t know what “fair and equitable” means when it comes to production of profitable materials. Reinitz responded that the first million dollars would go to the faculty member then after that the University takes a percentage. Reinitz thought the policy was very “pro-faculty.” Report received.

- X. **Moved (Barry)/S/P** to endorse the Curriculum Committee action to incorporate the Academic Standards Committee’s interpretation of the upper division requirement into the curriculum document.
- XI. **Moved/S/P** to adjourn.

Respectfully submitted,

Dan Burgard
Scribe of the Day

Tiffany Aldrich MacBain
Secretary, Faculty Senate

2010-2011 UEC membership:

Jim Evans, Peter Greenfield (Chair, fall), Cathy Hale, Brendan Lanctot, Danny McMillian, Sarah Moore (ex officio), Heidi Orloff, Dawn Padula, Benjamin Tromly, Jennifer Utrata (Chair, spring)

The Senate charges to the 2010-2011 University Enrichment Committee in addition to the committee's regular business were:

1. Reconsider the category caps in the conference travel reimbursement scheme, with an eye to increasing fairness across disciplines without impacting the total budget.
2. Draft a request to the Budget Task Force to increase support for conference travel.
3. Consider making it possible for applicants with pending sabbaticals, whose projects will require IRB approval) to apply for funding before IRB approval has been granted. IRB approval often cannot be obtained so early. Disbursement of funds would still be contingent on IRB approval.
4. Consider adjustments to student research and travel award criteria to "spread the wealth".
5. Standardize reimbursement for mailing and printing costs (similar to mileage reimbursement) for student research grants.

Committee Actions Regarding Senate Charges and Usual Duties Related to Travel, Research, and Release Time Awards

Usual duties

1. Faculty travel funding

As of May 2, 2011, the UEC has received a total of 88 travel requests. Of these, 74 were funded, 3 trips were initially funded but later cancelled, 1 request was denied, and 10 are pending second trip requests that will be considered after May 15. This is fewer than the 100 or so requests the committee typically receives each year. A total of \$84,381 has been allocated to cover the 74 trips (mean = \$1,140.28) against a total budget this year of \$116,577. (Note that total funds this year included \$93,000 yearly allocation, \$15,298 from unused departmental funds, and \$8,280 rolled forward from the previous year.) Assuming that the committee does not receive a high number of proposals in the next 13 days, the remaining \$32,196 will cover all second trip requests this year.

2. Faculty research funding

The committee received 12 applications this year (8 in the fall and 4 in the spring) and all were funded fully or in part for a total of \$16,050 allocated (\$22,842.69 was requested) in 2010-11. The mean award per grant equaled \$1337.50. This was similar to previous years. As a reminder, the faculty research budget equaled \$21,000 this year -- \$16,000 from the yearly allocation and \$5000 from Phibbs endowment earnings.

3. Release time requests

The committee received 7 applications for teaching release units, and 6 faculty members were granted a one-unit release. (Five release units are usually awarded each year and one of this year's grants was funded from an external grant).

4. Student research and travel funding

The committee received a total of 94 applications for student research and travel this year, a significant increase from past year's averages of 60 to 70. The committee received 37 student travel applications (35 granted) and 57 student research applications (54 granted), for a total of \$36,292 allocated. Of these 57 research applications, 36 were received at the spring deadline.

This demand represents a significant challenge for the committee as it had budgeted \$29,938 for the entire year and used some \$6,000 from savings to cover the requests (in most years, some 15% of the allocated money is not spent, so conservatively, some \$5000 will likely be reclaimed.) In part, the high number of applications in the spring made it difficult to allocate the money evenly over the year, to stay within budget, and not to put spring applicants at a disadvantage over fall applicants. Anticipating that demand will remain high, next year's committee will need to address this issue.

5. Cultural currency travel funding

No applications for travel related to cultural currency were received.

6. Trimble Asian Studies Professional Development Awards

The committee received 4 applications for the Trimble Professional Development Awards. Since all applicants met the award guidelines, all 4 faculty members were granted their requests for a total of \$19,225, leaving \$10,775 unspent. Sarah Moore notified Dave Beers of the unspent funding so that he could discuss this with the Trimbles as it might relate to how they divide their gift between Short Term Study Abroad and Faculty Research.

7. Selection of Regester Lecturer for 2012

Several candidates were nominated for the Regester but then did not submit materials to the UEC. After reviewing the work of the outstanding nominees who submitted materials for the UEC's consideration, the Committee concluded that George Tomlin's scholarly contributions and teaching excellence made him an exemplary representative of the University community. George Tomlin was chosen as Regester Lecturer for 2012. This is the first time the Regester Lecture

will be given by a faculty member from the Schools of Occupational and Physical Therapy.

8. Selection for the Dirk Andrew Phibbs Memorial Award

The committee reviewed proposals from faculty for UEC research funding and decided that Patrick O'Neil's proposal most closely fit the spirit of the Memorandum of Understanding for the Phibbs Award (especially the Phibbs's desire that the recipient use the funds to "learn through travel" and "gain new perspectives" in another culture).

Senate Charges

#1 and #2: Reconsider the category caps in the conference travel reimbursement scheme, and draft a request to the Budget Task Force to increase support for conference travel.

In the fall, the committee decided that there was insufficient time to pursue a solid, convincing request to the Budget Task Force by mid-October for increased conference travel funds. Instead, the UEC discussed this issue in the spring in light of the university-wide changes underway with the P-card system. Since the P-card system does away with the feasibility of category caps for various categories related to conference travel, there was discussion of potentially revamping the way in which the UEC provides oversight for faculty conference travel. Currently the UEC reimburses faculty members for expenses and we have a rather labor- and paper-intensive system, whereas the move to a P-card system allows people to spend money without a lot of prior approval. The committee also discussed the idea of getting out of the business of tracking final reports by making the submission of a participant's final report to the UEC a requirement for getting any future conference travel grants approved. Several new issues will arise with the extension of the P-card system, and the UEC will not be able to be accountable entirely in terms of final reporting from faculty members.

The committee also discussed modifying the form for requesting conference participation travel funding in order to gather better data in support of the faculty's need for increased conference funding. Although this year thus far has had 78 first trip requests and 10 second trip requests for conference funding, as opposed to the more typical number of 100 or so requests, in general faculty report a difficulty in keeping costs within the limits of the category caps. Yet even though the category caps will be eliminated with the P-card system, the form as it currently exists does not encourage faculty to report the additional, often significant, expenses they frequently incur. The form also does not capture expenses such as internet use and printing/poster production which may be incurred during conference participation. Sarah Moore volunteered to revise the form for the upcoming fiscal year, in light of the need to better capture the reality of actual faculty expenses. The information gained from faculty on a revised form will allow the UEC to better make their case for increased conference funding in next year's planned request to the Budget Task Force.

#3. Consider making it possible for applicants with pending sabbaticals, whose projects will require IRB approval) to apply for funding before IRB approval has

been granted.

Although there was much discussion of this issue in the fall, as well as collaboration with the IRB Chair at a subcommittee meeting, in the spring the committee learned that it would be sufficient to require applicants for leaves and release time to sign a form stating that they understood the requirement of IRB approval for any work with human subjects, and would agree to obtain that approval before beginning work. Therefore, the UEC decided to allow applicants for grants to do research involving human subjects to apply without IRB approval if the work is to be done during leaves or release time, and if they sign to indicate that they understand the requirement of IRB approval and will not begin work until such approval is obtained. The committee directed the Associate Deans' office to add the necessary statement and signature line to the application form. Other faculty research requests will still have to document IRB approval on application.

A related IRB issue was much discussed by the UEC this year, involving the challenges that OT/PT students experience in procuring IRB approval by the fall deadline. Very few of the students applying for research funding this year had an IRB in hand at the time of application. Although there was much discussion of how to handle this issue, at the UEC's final meeting of the year on April 25th, the committee approved new language requiring that a copy of a submitted IRB be attached to each student application and that if the application was approved by the UEC, funding would not be released until the Associate Deans' Office had been notified of IRB approval. In addition to this change, Sarah Moore and George Tomlin developed a system internally for handling the competing pressures of the UEC needing students to have IRB approval, OT's scheduling being such that students often aren't able to secure IRB approval in accordance with the UEC's deadlines, and the difficulty for the Associate Deans' office and Accounting of managing and tracking student research award letters in different stages of approval. With the approval of new language related to human subjects research on student research applications and this new internal system to meet the needs of OT/PT, the UEC feels confident that it has at least diminished the challenges many OT/PT students face in this area while still maintaining proper IRB approval standards.

#4. Consider adjustments to student research and travel award criteria to “spread the wealth”.

The committee discussed this charge thoroughly but the consensus was that there is too much variation – between individual student requests and from year to year – to make it possible to find some formula for figuring the size of grants. The most difficult problem is anticipating in the fall how much to reserve for spring applicants, but we are doing the best we can, and all well-constructed student applications have received significant funding.

#5. Standardize reimbursement for mailing and printing costs (similar to mileage reimbursement) for student research grants.

The committee decided to set a limit of two dollars per subject for mailing costs for surveys, and to include that figure, as well as the university standard figures for mileage and per diem, in the guidelines for applying for student research funding. The \$2 per person figure agrees well with the estimates made by a fall subcommittee and students will continue to be reimbursed for their actual costs – up to a limit of \$2 a head and \$500 for the project as a whole. Students will now be expected to break costs down by categories, such as stationery, postage, etc.

Recommendations for next year's committee:

1. Consider reallocating the amounts for student research and travel, potentially shifting categories for student reimbursement. The committee might consider decreasing the award for student travel, for example, since the current policy usually awards \$500 per request.
2. Develop more specific guiding criteria for determining recipients of the Phibbs Memorial Award each year. Currently each year's UEC is considering candidates based on the Memorandum of Understanding, faculty research award recipients from the past two years, and awardee lists, but the process of determining awards could be streamlined significantly with the development of specific guiding criteria for yearly use.
3. Determine how the UEC might shift its role in providing oversight of faculty conference travel requests in light of the university's move to a P-card system. The P-card system makes the use of category caps impossible, requiring some changes to the UEC's past "reimbursement" role, but it still needs to be determined which changes to UEC requirements -- such as final reporting requirements -- are advisable, in order to create a less labor and paper intensive process overall while ensuring proper oversight.
4. Determine whether the costs for reimbursing transcription can be standardized for student research grants. Students have submitted widely varying estimates for transcription and cost-savings might be found in this area.

Attachment B

Date: April 28, 2011
To: Faculty Senate
From: Derek Buescher, Curriculum Committee Chair

2010-2011 Curriculum Committee Final Report

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION..... 11

CHARGES..... 11

DISCUSSION OF CHARGES..... 12

CONTINUE THE ONGOING BUSINESS OF THE COMMITTEE..... 12

 Five Year Reviews..... 12

ON-GOING ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION OF THE CORE RUBRICS..... 12

 Review of Specific Core Areas 12

 Evaluation of Program and Core Course Proposals 13

 Establishment of the Academic Calendar 13

REVIEW OF THE INDEPENDENT STUDY GUIDELINES..... 13

ADDITION OF LIBRARY DIRECTOR TO CURRICULUM COMMITTEE..... 14

REGISTRATION FOR SPRING FIRST YEAR SEMINARS..... 14

CORE DISCUSSION ON DIVERSITY..... 14

BUSINESS TO BE CARRIED OVER TO 2011-2012 15

REPORTS AND APPENDICES..... 16

 Appendix A: Administrative Curriculum Action: 2010-2011..... 16

 Appendix B: Working Group Assignments and Membership 25

 Appendix C: Report of the Curriculum Committee on the Environmental Policy and
 Decision Making Program Review 26

 Appendix D: Report of the Curriculum Committee on the Center for Writing, Teaching,
 and Learning Review..... 27

 Appendix E: Report of the Curriculum Committee on the Science, Technology, and
 Society Review 28

 Appendix F: Report of the Curriculum Committee on the Politics and Government
 Review 29

 Appendix G: Report of the Curriculum Committee on the Psychology Review 30

 Appendix H: Report of the Curriculum Committee on the Religion Review 31

 Appendix I: Report of the Curriculum Committee on the Humanities Review..... 32

 Appendix J: Report of the Curriculum Committee on the Philosophy Review..... 33

 Appendix K: Report of the Curriculum Committee on the Physical Education Review 34

 Appendix L: Report on Natural Scientific Approaches Core Review..... 35

 Appendix M: Note From Director of Advising Jack Roundy on Sequencing courses in
 the Approaches Cores 36

 Appendix N: Mathematical Approaches Core Guidelines Changes 37

 Appendix O: Report and Changes to Independent Study Policy..... 38

 Appendix P: Proposed Change to the Curriculum Committee Membership (Library
 Director) 40

 Appendix Q: Fall Grades Due Date, email from Brad Tomhave, Registrar..... 41

INTRODUCTION

This report summarizes the work undertaken by the Curriculum Committee academic year (AY) 2010-2011.

The chair would like to acknowledge the dedicated work of the entire committee. Each member undertook his or her responsibilities toward the review and oversight of the University's curriculum with the utmost professionalism. In addition to the member's dedicated work in the continuation of the 5-working groups (list and charges appears in Appendix B) members rotated the duties of recording secretary with diligence. As chair, I am indebted to the work of every member of this group.

CHARGES

The Curriculum Committee received and/or generated several charges for AY 2010-2011. These charges are outlined below. More comprehensive descriptions of our work on these charges begins immediately after the outline.

1. Continue the ongoing business of the Committee, including
 - (a) 5-year reviews of departments and programs
 - i. Environmental Policy and Decision Making (review accepted 10/20/10)
 - ii. Physical Therapy (review accepted 11/10/10; no report submitted)
 - iii. Center for Writing, Teaching, and Learning (review accepted 12/1/10)
 - iv. Science, Technology, and Society (review accepted 12/1/10)
 - v. Politics and Government (review accepted 12/1/10)
 - vi. Psychology (review accepted 2/9/11)
 - vii. Religion (review accepted 2/9/11)
 - viii. Humanities (reviews accepted 4/20/11)
 - ix. Philosophy (review accepted 4/20/11)
 - x. Physical Education (review accepted 4/20/11)
 - xi. African American Studies (deferred to 2011-2012)
 - xii. Biology/Molecular Biology (deferred to 2011-2012)
 - xiii. Occupational Therapy (deferred to 2011-2012)
 - xiv. Dual Degree Engineering (deferred to 2011-2012)
 - (b) Ongoing Assessments and Evaluations of Core Rubrics
 - i. Review of specific core areas including
 1. Fine Arts Approaches Rubric (charge developed from 2008-9 committee and extended by the 2010-2011 committee)
 2. Natural Scientific Approaches
 3. Mathematical Approaches
 - (c) Evaluation of Program and Core Course Proposals (Administrative Action Report; Appendix A)
 - (d) Establishment of the Academic Calendar
2. Review of the Independent Study guidelines and procedures for approval.
3. Addition of Library Director to Curriculum Committee

4. Work with Registrar and Academic Advising to determine if there is a mechanism for students to pre-select their spring seminar based on topic.
5. Discussion of Core Rubrics with attention to the integration of diversity.

DISCUSSION OF CHARGES

CONTINUE THE ONGOING BUSINESS OF THE COMMITTEE

Five Year Reviews

In AY 2010-11 the Curriculum Committee accepted the reviews of Environmental Policy and Decision Making (10/20/10), Physical Therapy (11/10/10), Center for Writing, Teaching, and Learning (12/1/10), Science, Technology, and Society (12/1/10), Politics and Government (12/1/10), Psychology (2/9/11), Religion (review accepted 2/9/11), Humanities (4/20/11), Philosophy (4/20/11), Physical Education (4/20/11). Each of these reviews is detailed in the Appendices C-K, respectively.

The reviews of the African American Studies, Biology/Molecular Biology, Occupational Therapy, and the Dual Degree Engineering were deferred until 2011-2012.

As part of accepting the Humanities Program curriculum review, the Curriculum Committee approved the implementation of a Humanities Minor.

ON-GOING ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION OF THE CORE RUBRICS

Under the plan to review areas of the core on a five-year rotation with a complete review of the core conducted in the fifth year, the Curriculum Committee, adopting charges in part or whole from the complete core review during 2009-2010, engaged in both a series of conversations with faculty about specific areas of the core as well as evaluated potential changes to specific areas of the core with an eye toward improving elements within and continuity among areas of the core.

Review of Specific Core Areas

Fine Arts Approaches

The 2009-10 committee asked the Senate to charge the Curriculum Committee with evaluation of the Fine Arts Approaches rubric guidelines and "learning objectives." This charge, carried over from 2008-2009, was to determine a) if the language of the Fine Arts (FA) Approaches rubric and objectives were sufficiently clear to draw distinctions between what would and would not count as an FA core course; b) potentially create language to assist faculty in developing courses to meet the core rubric guidelines; and c) insure consistency between the rubric guidelines and learning objectives. The process for this change began during the 2006-2007 Fine Arts Approaches review and developed in consultation with faculty delivering the core courses and departments that bear the primary burden for servicing the Fine Arts core. To date, no action has been taken on this objective. Under standard operating procedure, it appears the rubric is both sufficient at the moment and will be up for full review on the 5-year cycle in 2011-2012 at which time a more complete discussion of the core area may be undertaken.

Natural Scientific Approaches

As part of the routine 5-year review of each core area, Working Group Four conducted a survey and met with faculty who teach in the Natural Scientific Approaches core. This review indicated the core is working as intended and no core changes were recommended. The Working Group did recommend that the advising manual could include "specific section[s] on the core guidelines and objectives." This information has been passed along to the Director of Advising (see full review in Appendix L and a note of response/clarification regarding advising and sequencing from Director of Advising Jack Roundy in Appendix M).

Mathematical Approaches

As part of the routine 5-year review of each core area, Working Group Five conducted a survey and met with members of the faculty who teach Mathematical Approaches courses. Those teaching in the Mathematical Approaches core believed that the current language did not adequately accommodate calculus and offered language to better describe current practices. Faculty proposed the language changes (see Appendix N) that were accepted by the Curriculum Committee and then the full faculty at the April 19, 2011 faculty meeting.

Evaluation of Program and Core Course Proposals

The Committee reviewed a number of core course proposals (see Administrative Action Report in Appendix A).

Establishment of the Academic Calendar

The committee continued discussions of the Academic Calendar with attention to equity in length of the Fall and Spring terms and the potential of ending Fall prior to Thanksgiving. For a variety of reasons, this conversation was postponed indefinitely. The committee approved the appropriate Academic Calendars for 2013-2014, 2014-2015 (draft). A change to the Fall 2011 calendar was approved: move the due date for final fall grades from January 2, 2012 to January 3, 2012 and the Probation/Dismissal meeting for Fall 2011 from January 3, 2012 to January 4, 2012. This change is necessary because January 2, 2011 is a university holiday in 2012.

REVIEW OF THE INDEPENDENT STUDY GUIDELINES

The 2010-2011 Curriculum Committee asked the Senate to charge the committee in continuing work on clarifying the process and guidelines for Independent Studies (IS). After the committee rejected a proposal requiring each IS to be approved by the committee, Working Group Four undertook an evaluation of the guidelines (see Appendix O). The committee passed two modifications:

1. Modified independent study contract to include uniform hourly requirements for full- and partial-credit courses; to require more detailed information about assignments, meetings, and weights for each assignment in the course grade); to allow the instructor to prevent a student from taking the course Pass/Fail.
2. Modified self-study guide for 5-year curriculum review to include discussion of independent study courses and how they fit within the departmental curriculum.

ADDITION OF LIBRARY DIRECTOR TO CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

In 2009-2010, Library Director, Jane Carlin, requested the Curriculum Committee consider adding the Library Director (ex officio) as a member of the full committee. The rationale for this addition was to formally recognize the relationship between the library and the University's curriculum. The committee voted to amend the Faculty Bylaws and add the Library Director (ex officio) on April 20, 2011 (see Appendix P). The Bylaws amendment will be brought to the full faculty in September 2011.

REGISTRATION FOR SPRING FIRST YEAR SEMINARS

The Curriculum Committee discussed, at various points over the last two-years, the prospect of allowing entering students to preselect their Spring seminars. Given that Associate Professor of English, Julie Nelson Christoph is currently examining a number of possibilities relative to the first year seminars, the committee opted to wait for her findings prior to discussing any substantive changes to scheduling or content of the seminars.

CORE DISCUSSION ON DIVERSITY

The committee spent considerable time discussing the possibility of adding a "diversity" requirement to the University core. Spurred by the Fall Faculty conversation and comments from President Thomas and Vice President Bartanen regarding the changing racial, social, cultural, and economic composition of future classes, the committee examined the current core structure and content while also examining the core offerings of peer and aspiring institutions. The committee recognizes that many courses and activities on campus already critically engage questions of diversity and that any discussion about altering the core would be an attempt to both recognize the work already undertaken by faculty, students, and staff as well formalize that work in a manner consistent with the University's mission and learning objectives. Furthermore, the committee recognizes that the addition of a new core area would present complications in staffing and difficulties in students' plans of study. Nonetheless, the committee was unanimous that the 2011-2012 committee be charged with continuing this work. To assist the 2011-2012 committee the 2010-2011 committee offers the following considerations:

- One of the University's primary responsibilities is to help students understand, negotiate, and be critical in and of a multicultural world.
- We believe it is important to think of diversity not as a list, but as the norms and structures created through social interaction.
- Moving beyond diversity as a "list" the committee desires for students to engage questions of diversity relative to difference and the outcomes of difference.
- Core changes need not be wide sweeping and innovative approaches may allow for a simpler addition of diversity to the core. For example, diversity could be "aspirational" and include a list of potential courses (as Whitman has done) or the University could allow courses to count for the new diversity approaches while also counting as another core requirement (e.g. Humanistic, Natural Scientific, or Fine Arts Approaches; Connections).
- The Curriculum Committee should seek collaboration with the Chief Diversity Officer and the Faculty Diversity Committee who are already undertaking the challenges of diversity at Puget Sound.

BUSINESS TO BE CARRIED OVER TO 2011-2012

1. Review departments and programs scheduled for 2011-2012 including the following deferred reviews:
 - a. African American Studies
 - b. Biology/Microbiology
 - c. Occupational Therapy
 - d. Dual Degree Engineering
2. Continue discussion of a Diversity Core
3. Consult with Academic Advising on sequencing of Core and departmental major/minor courses.
4. Revise calendar-setting guidelines to accommodate January university holiday (see Appendix Q, email from Brad Tomhave).
5. Revise curriculum review guidelines.

REPORTS AND APPENDICES

Appendix A: Administrative Curriculum Action: 2010-2011

Date	Course Number	Course Title	Action Taken
Summer 2010	CHIN 307	Through the Cinematic Lens: Old and New China in Film	New course approved.
Summer 2010	FL 115	The Problem of Evil	Department designation change accepted: HUM 115 New title accepted.
Summer 2010	FL 125	The Quest for King Arthur	Department designation change accepted: HUM 125.
Summer 2010	HIST 322	The Cold War in Europe	New course approved.
Summer 2010	HIST 324	Russia since 1861	New course number accepted: HIST 224
Summer 2010	HUM 121	Arms and Men: The Rhetoric of Warfare	New course letter assigned: HUM 121B New title accepted for 121B: Arms and Men: The Rhetoric of War in the Twentieth Century New description accepted for 121B.
Summer 2010	LC 116	Skills to Success in College	New description accepted.
Summer 2010	NRSC 201	Introduction to Neuroscience	New title accepted: Foundations of Neuroscience
Summer 2010	PHIL 402	Topics in the History of Philosophy	New description accepted.
Summer 2010	PSYC 100	Skills to Success in College	New description accepted.
Summer 2010	SPAN 401	Seminar in Medieval and/or Early Modern Iberia	New description accepted.
09/07/2010	COMM 103	Rhetoric of Adventure	New title accepted: Imperialism and Cinema New description accepted.
09/07/2010	HIST 307	The Crusades	New course approved.
09/07/2010	PG 319	Local Politics	New course approved.
09/07/2010	PG 339	US Foreign Policy in the Middle East	New course approved.
09/14/2010	GERM 250	Culture and History of Germany	New number accepted: 304 New title accepted: German History and Political Systems New description accepted.
09/16/2010	STS 144	Darwin in his Time	New title accepted: Darwin's

9/22/2010	ECON 384	Advanced Empirical Methods in Economics	Century New course approved.
9/22/2010	COMM 368	Systems in Organizations	New title accepted: Environment and Organizational Practice New description accepted.
9/23/2010	CLSC 280	The Archaeology of the Mediterranean World	New course approved.
10/13/2010	EXSC 340	Equipment Design	New course approved.
10/13/2010	COMM 384	Topics in Communication	New title accepted: Topics in Communication: Family Communication New letter designation: 384B New description accepted.
10/13/10	PG 349	Machiavelli	New course approved.
10/13/10	PSYC 265	Cross-Cultural Psychology	New course approved.
10/13/10	PSYC 373	Language Development	New prerequisite accepted.
10/13/10	PG 440	Machiavelli	New course approved; cross-listed as PG 349; senior research seminar in political theory
10/13/10	PG 441	Liberalism and Its Critics	New course approved; cross-listed as PG 341; senior research seminar in political theory
10/14/10	PG 341	Liberalism and its Critics	New description accepted.
10/14/10	Music	Requirement for Music Major, Item #3	Additional requirement accepted: “Music education students must also have experiences in small ensembles.”
10/14/10	PG 349	Machiavelli	New description accepted.
10/14/10	CLSC 303	Literary Criticism and Classical Literature	New course approved.
10/14/10	GRK 101	Introduction to Ancient Greek I	New description accepted.
10/14/10	GRK 102	Introduction to Ancient Greek II	New description accepted.
10/14/10	LAT 101	Elementary Latin I	New description accepted.
10/14/10	LAT 102	Elementary Latin II	New description accepted.
10/14/10	COMM 252	Public Communication Campaigns	New title accepted: Health Communication Campaigns New description accepted
10/14/10	GEOL 340	Climate Change	New course approved. Crosslisted as ENVR 340
10/14/10	ENVR 340	Climate Change	New course approved. Crosslisted as GEOL 340
10/14/10	MUS 355	String Pedagogy	New course approved.
10/14/10	PG 440	Research Seminar in Political Theory	Course removed from curriculum (replaced by <i>Machiavelli</i>).

10/20/2010	ART 280	William Morris and His World	New Fine Arts Approaches core course approved.
10/20/2010	ENGL 139	Gender, Literacy, and International Development	New Seminar in Scholarly and Creative Inquiry core course approved.
10/20/2010	HUM 302	Individuality and Transcendence in Medieval Literature	New Humanistic Approaches core course approved.
10/20/2010	IPE 427	Competing Perspectives on the Material World	Connections core course reinstated.
10/21/2010	CSOC 100	Exploring the Higher Education Experience through a Sociological Lens	New title accepted: Exploring the College Experience
10/26/2010	CSOC 312	People of Southeast Asia	New title accepted: Indonesia and Southeast Asia in Cultural Context New prerequisite accepted (includes travel requirement). New description accepted.
10/27/2010	FL 200	Introduction to Literary Studies	Removed from curriculum
10/27/2010	FL 305	Modern French Theatre: From Cocteau to Beckett	Removed from curriculum
10/27/2010	FL 380	An Archeology of the Boom: Modern Latin American Prose Fiction	Removed from curriculum
10/27/2010	FL 381	Women and Revolution in Latin American Literature	Removed from curriculum
10/27/2010	FL 382	Conquest and Consequences in Latin American Cultures	Removed from curriculum
10/27/2010	FL 383	Latino Literature: Borders, Bridges, and Fences	Removed from curriculum
10/27/2010	Fl 385	Don Quijote: The Quest for Modern Fiction	Removed from curriculum
10/27/2010	FL 387	Writing the Nation: The Case of Nineteenth-Century Spain	Removed from curriculum
10/27/2010	FL 393	Individuality and Transcendence in Medieval Literature	Removed from curriculum
10/27/2010	HUM 300	Children's Literature: To Teach and to Entertain	New Connections core course approved.
10/27/2010	EDUC 620	Interdisciplinarity, Identity and Institutions	New title accepted: Adolescent Identities, Literacies, and Communities

10/27/2010	ENVR 101	Introduction to Environmental Policy and Decision Making	New description accepted. New course approved.
11/01/2010	LAS 380	Around Macondo in Eighty Days	New description accepted.
11/01/10	SPAN 210	Spanish in the U.S.	New course approved.
11/08/10	MATH 420-	Advanced Topics in Mathematics	Letter designation assigned: 420B New topic accepted: History of Mathematics New course description accepted.
11/15/10	MUS 126	History of Rock Music	New course approved. Satisfies the Fine Arts Approaches core requirement.
11/16/10	SIM	The Politics of Health Care	Special Interdisciplinary Major for Daniel Parecki approved.
11/22/10	PT 625	Introduction to Critical Inquiry	New description accepted
11/22/10	PT 635	Ambulatory Function	New description accepted.
11/22/10	PT 645	Adult Neurologic Rehabilitation	New description accepted.
11/22/10	PT 647	Physical Therapy Across the Lifespan: Pediatrics	New description accepted.
11/22/10	PT 655	Principles of Cardiopulmonary Physical Therapy	New course number approved.: PT 633
11/22/10	PT 657	Integrated Clinical Experience III	New title accepted: Full-Time Clinical Internship I New description accepted.
11/22/10	PT 660	Integrated Clinical Experience IV	New title accepted: Integrated Clinical Experience III
11/22/10	PT 662	Clinical Research: Application to Practice	New description accepted.
11/22/10	PT 687	Integrated Clinical Experience V	New title accepted: Full-Time Clinical Internship II New description accepted.
11/22/10	PT 688	Integrated Clinical Experience VI	New title accepted: Full-Time Clinical Internship III New description accepted.
11/22/10	MUS 356	Pedagogy of Singing	Change for Class Schedule/Transcript title approved: PED SING
11/30/10	MUS 356	Pedagogy of Singing	Change for Class Schedule/Transcript title approved: Vocal Pedagogy
11/30/10	ENGL 204	Media Laboratory: Journalism	Change department/program prefix to LC (LC 204)

11/30/10	LC 204	Media Laboratory: Journalism	Change department/program prefix to LC from ENGL
12/14/10	REL 120	Communities of Resistance and Liberation	Spelling errors corrected in description.
12/14/10	HIST 340	Tolstoy, Gandhi, and King: A History of Nonviolent Social Change in the Twentieth Century	Course removed from the curriculum
02/15/11	PHIL 331	Metaphysics	New course approved.
02/16/11	EDUC 294	Schools & Poverty	New course approved.
02/16/11	PG 327	Ethnic Conflict in World Politics	New course approved.
02/16/11	PHIL 378	Philosophy of Law	New prerequisite accepted: One course in Philosophy or PG 104, PG 340-348. Cross-listed with PG348.
02/17/11	PSYC 315	Psychology and the Legal System	New number approved: Psyc 370. New title accepted: Psychology, Mental Health, & Law. New prerequisite: PSYC 201 and 145, 295, 395, 460 or 495. New description accepted.
02/18/11	HUM 302	Individuality and Transcendence in Medieval Literature	New description accepted.
02/18/11	HUM 303	The Monstrous Middle Ages	New description accepted.
02/18/11	SPAN 310B	Special Topics in Literary and Cultural Studies	New title for section B: The Land of the Incas.
02/18/11	PHIL 109	Life, Death, and Meaning	New description accepted.
02/18/11	PHIL 280	Social and Political Philosophy	New description accepted.
02/18/11	PHIL 281	Moral Philosophy	New description accepted.
02/23/11	PG 348	Philosophy of Law	New prerequisite accepted: one course in Philosophy or one course in Political Theory (PG 104, or 340-348). Crosslisted with PHIL 378.
02/23/11	BUS 493F	Animals, Business, and the Law	Changed to BUS 478 (removed BUS 493F)
03/02/11	CONN 370	The Good Life	New prefix accepted: HUM.
03/07/11	CLSC 203	Ancient Egypt	New course approved.
03/07/11	PG 330	Nuclear Politics	New course approved.
03/07/11	HUM 370	The Good Life	New course approved. CONN 370 removed

03/07/11	THTR 375	Engaging World Theatre: Tradition and Innovation	Title change approved: World Theatre I: African Diaspora. New description approved.
03/09/11	COMM 106	Communication and Well-being	New course approved; Fulfills the Writing and Rhetoric Seminar core requirement.
03/09/11	REL 150	Exploring Bioethics Today	New course approved; Fulfills the Scholarly and Creative Inquiry Seminar Requirement
03/09/11	CONN 373	Hawaii's Literatures	New course approved; fulfills the Connections core requirement
03/09/11	COMM 170	Introduction to Media Studies: Governmentality and Torture	New course approved; fulfills the Humanistic Approaches core requirement
03/09/11	HUM 316	The Lord of <i>The Ring</i> : Wagner's <i>Ring of the Nibelung</i>	New course approved; fulfills the Connections core requirement
03/09/11	HUM 335	Japan and the Dutch: A Cross-cultural Visual Dialogue 1600-2000	New course approved; fulfills the Connections core requirement
03/09/11	CHEM 347	The Devil's Playground: The Chemistry of Surfaces	New course approved
03/10/11	HIST 375	Women and Social Change in the U.S. Since 1880	Course removed from curriculum.
03/10/11	HIST 385	Cities, Workers, and Social Movements in Latin America, 1880- 1990	Course removed from curriculum.
03/11/11	CSOC 100	Exploring the College Experience	New title: The Sociology of College Life
03/15/11	ENGL 471D	Auteur Theory: Hitchcock	New topic, letter, title, description.
03/16/11	ECON 230	Property Rights and the Economics of Contracting	New course approved; offered Fall 2011 only.
03/16/11	CONN 341	Asia Pop!	Prefix changed: ASIA.
03/16/11	PT 642	Therapeutic Exercise I	New unit value (0.5). New description accepted.
03/16/11	PT 643	Therapeutic Exercise II	New description accepted.
03/16/11	PT 645	Adult Neurorehabilitation	New unit value (1.5).
03/16/11	PHIL 316	Chinese Philosophy	New course approved; offered Fall 2011 only.
03/16/11	ENVR 350	Puget Sound Environmental Issues Part I: Politics and Public	New course approved (0.25 unit).

03/16/11	ENVR 351	Participation Puget Sound Environmental Issues Part II: Laws and Land Use Designations	New course approved (0.25 unit).
03/18/11	BUS 493B	Special Topics: Social Entrepreneurship	New topic, letter, title, description.
03/18/11	CHEM 341	Physical Chemistry II	New description: lab component added.
03/18/11	CHEM 342	Physical Chemistry Lab	Removed from curriculum.
03/22/11	CONN 333	Forest Policy in the Pacific Northwest	Removed from curriculum.
03/22/11	CONN 342	Salmon Recovery in the Pacific Northwest	Removed from curriculum.
03/22/11	PSYC 273	Developmental Psychology: Prenatal through Childhood	New number: 220
03/22/11	PSYC 274	Developmental Psychology: Adolescence through the End of Life	New number: 221
03/22/11	PSYC 281	Social Psychology	New number: 225
03/22/11	PSYC 251	Introduction to Behavioral Neuroscience	New number: 230; new title: Behavioral Neuroscience
03/22/11	PSYC 200	Human Sexuality	New number: 250
03/22/11	PSYC 290	Industrial/Organizational Psychology	New number: 255
03/22/11	PSYC 320	Evolutionary Psychology	New number: 260 (change in course level). Prerequisite change: BIO 101, PSYC 101.
03/22/11	PSYC 341	Sensation and Perception	New number: 310; new title: Sensation, Perception and Action
03/22/11	PSYC 360	Experimental Analysis of Behavior	New number: 311; new title: Learning and Behavior
03/22/11	PSYC 371	Tests and Measurements	New number: 312; new title: Applied Psychological Measurement
03/22/11	PSYC 295	Abnormal Psychology	New number: 320; new title: Psychological Disorders
03/22/11	PSYC 331	History and Systems of Psychology	New number: 325
03/22/11	PSYC 361	Cognitive Psychology	New number: 335
03/22/11	PSYC 395	Developmental Psychopathology	New number: 350
03/22/11	PSYC 373	Language Development	New number: 351

03/22/11	PSYC 311	Behavioral Genetics	New number: 355
03/22/11	PSYC 310	Fundamentals of Clinical Neuropsychology	New number: 356; new title: Clinical Neuropsychology
03/22/11	PSYC 370	Special Topics: Cognition and Aging	New number: 371; new title: Cognition and Aging
03/22/11	PSYC 370	Special Topics: Illusions	New number: 372; new title: Illusions
03/22/11	PSYC 370	Special Topics: Perceiving Self and Other	New number: 373; new title: Perceiving Self and Other
03/22/11	PSYC 370	Special Topics: Psychology of Romantic Relationships	New number: 374; new title: Psychology of Romantic Relationships
03/23/11	PSYC 492	Perspectives on Behavior	New number: 401; new title: Perspectives
03/23/11	PSYC 460	Psychotherapy and Behavior Change	New number: 490
03/25/11	PSYC 313	Physiological Psychology	New course
03/25/11	PT 601	Basic Physical Therapy Skills I	New unit value: 0.25
03/25/11	PT 602	Basic Physical Therapy Skills II	New unit value: 0.50
03/28/11	SPAN 310C	Special Topics in Literary and Cultural Studies: Latin American Essay	New letter designation for this topic: C
03/28/11	ART 323	Angkor Wat and Vijayanagara: A Comparison	New description.
03/28/11	ENVR 320	Ecotourism as a Tool for Conservation and Sustainable Development in Sikkim India	New description (updated PacRim 2011-2012).
03/28/11	HIST 249	Political and Cultural History of the Kansai Region:	New description (updated for PacRim 2011-2012).
03/28/11	REL 337	Tibetan Buddhism	New course approved for PacRim 2011-2012.
04/15/11	BUS 493	International Business and Marketing in Vietnam	New course approved for PacRim 2011-2012.
04/15/11	HUM 400	A Seminar in Critical Theory	New course approved.
04/15/11	PHIL 401	Topics in Metaphysics and Epistemology	Prerequisite change: PHIL 228, 273, and any two of 215, 219, and 281.
04/15/11	PHIL 402	Topics in the History of	Prerequisite change: PHIL 215,

		Philosophy	219, and any two of PHIL 228, 273, and 281.
04/18/11	HUM 250	Digital Humanities	New description.
04/18/11	COMM 107	Rhetoric, Film, and National Identity	New description.
04/18/11	HUM 200	Homer to Hitchcock: The History of Ideas in the Arts	New course approved.
04/18/11	EDUC 296	Using Children's and Young Adult Literature to Teach for Social Justice	New course approved.
04/18/11	CONN 387	Children and the Law	Title change: Never-Never Land. New description.

Appendix B: Working Group Assignments and Membership

WORKING GROUP ONE:

Approaches core course approval; Fine Arts Approaches Rubric; African American Studies review, Biology/Molecular Biology review

- ◆ Steven Zopfi (lead)
- ◆ Rand Worland
- ◆ Hallie Conyers
- ◆ Alison Tracy Hale (fall)
- ◆ Alyce DeMarais

WORKING GROUP TWO:

First- year seminars; First-year seminar course approval; Humanities Program review; Environmental Policy and Decision Making review; Physical Therapy review

- ◆ Paul Loeb (lead)
- ◆ Emelie Peine
- ◆ Terry Beck
- ◆ Alyce DeMarais

WORKING GROUP THREE:

Connections core course approval; Religion review; Physical Education review; Psychology review

- ◆ Brad Richards (lead)
- ◆ Roger Allen
- ◆ Kent Hooper
- ◆ Brad Tomhave
- ◆ Alyce DeMarais

WORKING GROUP FOUR:

Natural Scientific Approaches core review; Science, Technology, and Society review; Center for Writing, Learning and Teaching review; Philosophy review

- ◆ Alisa Kessel (lead)
- ◆ Tatiana Kaminsky
- ◆ Amanda Mifflin
- ◆ Alyce DeMarais

WORKING GROUP FIVE:

Mathematical Approaches core review; Special Interdisciplinary Major (SIM) proposals; Occupational Therapy review; Politics and Government review; Dual Degree Engineering review

- ◆ Brad Reich (lead)
- ◆ Jonathan Stockdale
- ◆ Alec Wrolson
- ◆ Brad Tomhave
- ◆ Alyce DeMarais

Appendix C: Report of the Curriculum Committee on the Environmental Policy and Decision Making Program Review

October 2010

I am writing to let you know that the Curriculum Committee has accepted your ENVR program's review. As the lead of the working group assigned to your review, I am passing on to you our feedback on your review:

- 1) We agree that your current program title is somewhat cumbersome, and we like your idea of shortening it to: "Environmental Policy".
- 2) We appreciated your extensive and reflective answers to all the assigned questions, and we thought you did a great job of using data to support your answers.
- 3) We agree with your decision to keep your program as a minor, and also that this minor is a very useful complement to many other majors.
- 4) We thought you included some very good examples of team-teaching.
- 5) We think that the addition of Rachel DeMotts as an affiliated faculty has strengthened the minor with the addition of an international component.
- 6) As an issue for future deliberation, we wondered about your rationale for the science courses you require for the minor as an alternative to ENVR 105. Why these specific courses? And If ENVR 105 can take these place of these courses, does this mean that ENVR 105 is an introduction to science for non-science students? What is the overlap between these two options?
- 7) We appreciated your ongoing and independent evaluation/assessment of your program and we find that you have succeeded in achieving a very well-defined program.

Appendix D: Report of the Curriculum Committee on the Center for Writing, Teaching, and Learning Review

November 2010

The Curriculum Committee accepts the CWLT's 2010 Curricular Review.

The Working Group notes the following regarding the curriculum review:

CWLT provides a clear explanation and assessment of LC100, the only course currently taught at the Center. We were impressed by CWLT's success in fostering effective and efficient reading strategies. The data were especially useful in clarifying the impact of the reading course for students. We also believe that the development of a new algebra course will be a positive addition to the university's curriculum.

We recommend that the program more fully articulate its mission with respect to teaching goals (in addition to its writing and learning goals). While we appreciate that the curriculum review is concerned primarily with evaluation of LC100, we believe it would be useful for faculty to see CWLT's mission clearly articulated, as it concerns both students and teachers.

We also encourage CWLT to provide more expansive answers to questions 4a and 6 in future reports.

Appendix E: Report of the Curriculum Committee on the Science, Technology, and Society Review

November 2010

The Curriculum Committee accepts the STS 2010 Curricular Program Review.

The Working Group carefully reviewed the five-year curriculum review of the Science, Technology, and Society program and an addendum, submitted on November 22, 2010. The Working Group notes the following:

In general, we are pleased that the STS advisory committee has been so deliberate in developing the STS program and so responsive to the changing needs of STS students.

We found the initial report compelling, but incomplete. The addendum was necessary and extremely helpful to us as we completed the review. We encourage the STS program to include the information provided in the addendum in future reports. Given that the major is both complicated and interdisciplinary (or perhaps complicated because it is interdisciplinary), information about the number of required courses and the ancillary courses was especially helpful. In the future, we also recommend formatting the document so that it corresponds to the self-study guide, which makes it easier for you and for us to determine that each of the required aspects of the review is discussed.

We noted that the process for student completion and faculty evaluation of seminar papers was impressive (even a model for other programs or departments).

The addendum also made clear that STS contributes a great deal to the university's commitments to diversity and to writing.

Appendix F: Report of the Curriculum Committee on the Politics and Government Review

December 2010

The Politics and Government department did a thorough and thoughtful job of addressing the questions from the review guidelines and structured their responses clearly. It is clear the department has undertaken changes recently, such as offering both "thesis" and "field seminar" courses that will require ongoing examination and evaluation. The department is also continuing to discuss the current language and statistics requirements and recognize they will need to review their roles in the coming years. The major is heavily invested in interdisciplinary programs including collaboration and/or interaction with Environmental Policy and Decision Making, Asian Studies, African American Studies, IPE, FLIA, Latin American Studies, and Freshman seminars.

Appendix G: Report of the Curriculum Committee on the Psychology Review

February 2011

The department did a thorough and thoughtful job of addressing the questions from the review guidelines, and structured their responses clearly. They generated a set of "Burning Issues" to be considered during their internal discussions, ranging from elective structure and course prerequisites to key expectations, learning objectives, and course sequencing. In their review they then proposed several changes to their curriculum, the most significant of which were a systematic renumbering of courses to better reflect each course's role in the curriculum, and an increase from 9 to 10 units in Psychology for the major. The latter change was motivated by the observation that their current requirement (three electives, two of which are at the 300/400 level) allowed students to graduate having taken a "very narrow range" of classes. Students have also been reluctant to take additional 200-level courses, which serve as a foundation for upper-level work in Psychology. The new requirement will be four electives, two from a new "foundations category" plus two upper-level electives.

Our committee requested additional information from the department regarding the observations leading to the increase in the number of required units and asking for clarifications regarding the department's commitment to the new Neuroscience program, and we were satisfied with the department's response: Roughly half of recent majors had graduated with a range of electives considered insufficient in breadth as determined by faculty observations, discussions with advisees, and the results of a senior survey over the past five years. Psychology faculty will continue to be in the pool of eligible internship advisors for Neuroscience-related research projects as in the past.

Appendix H: Report of the Curriculum Committee on the Religion Review

February 2011

The Religion department also did a thorough and thoughtful job of addressing the questions from the review guidelines and structured their responses clearly. The department proposed two relatively minor changes to their curriculum: Some 400-level courses may now add that permission of instructor is required, in an effort to better control the mixed audiences that can occur in upper-level Religion courses. They will also renumber all 100-level courses except first-year seminars to 200-level to help distinguish between the two groups.

Their discussion of outcomes and assessment was adequate, but more detail would have been valuable. The department listed mechanisms for collecting information on student outcomes (e.g exams and papers generated as coursework) but could have said more about how this information was processed and acted upon. The same is true for some of the less formal but potentially richer information gleaned from events such as the yearly student/faculty dinners.

Appendix I: Report of the Curriculum Committee on the Humanities Review

April 2011

Many thanks to the Humanities faculty for your extensive and thoughtful review of the Humanities program. We are happy with your various proposals to modify the Humanities program and tomorrow we will be recommending that your review be approved by the Curriculum Committee.

There are a few issues in your review that raised some questions for us, and we hope that you will work with Dean Alyce DeMarais in the future to address them:

- 1) With respect to your proposed minor: a) We expect that the director of the program will have to be vigilant to ensure that there is adequate staffing to meet the demand for the required HUM 200 and HUM 400 courses. We understand that you will likely want to draw this staffing especially from the core faculty involved, from those who have joint appointments in the Humanities program, and from faculty teaching in retirement. b) Is there a reason why you don't want to make HUM 200 a core course? This might help to draw students into the Humanities minor.
- 2) We are glad to see that your assessment plan is off to a good start, and we think you could go ahead now and use the HUM 400 course to yield some concrete measures of student outcomes.
- 3) We appreciated your candid answers to the diversity questions. But you didn't quite say what concrete steps you will be taking to address the problem, so we hope that you will do that next.
- 4) We found your digital humanities component interesting and valuable. We were also glad to see that you gave a broad meaning to this component and that you made it clear that different faculty could approach this component in many different ways. We think this proviso is very important, since this aspect of your program is quite new and the related technology is changing very rapidly.

Appendix J: Report of the Curriculum Committee on the Philosophy Review

April 2011

The Curriculum Committee accepts the Philosophy Department's 2010 Curricular Review.

The Working Group carefully reviewed the five-year curriculum review of the Department of Philosophy, submitted during the spring 2011 semester. The Working Group notes the following:

The Philosophy Department is commended for its thorough, thoughtful, and deliberate curricular review. The department has demonstrated its responsiveness to student needs. Moreover, recent additions to the faculty and to the course offerings have strengthened an already strong curriculum.

The department contributes invaluable to the University curriculum, offering several core courses, including 6 SCIS courses and offerings in two core areas (humanistic approaches and mathematical approaches). Philosophy courses are also cross-listed by many departments across campus. The members of the Working Group noted that Philosophy is essential to the University's mission (and to the liberal arts in general).

The assessment strategies adopted by the department are to be commended for "closing the loop." However, the Working Group recommends that the Philosophy Department consider revising the survey instrument for graduating majors. While the formalization of student input is a good idea, the Working Group believes that some of the items in the survey may be too broadly (and vaguely) worded to yield useful information for assessment.

Appendix K: Report of the Curriculum Committee on the Physical Education Review

April 2011

The review from Physical Education was brief well organized. It proposed no changes to their program, though noted that they were monitoring trends in the popularity of physical fitness and recreational activities with the goal of being responsive where possible. The review omitted responses to questions 3, 4, 5, 7, 9. Our working group asked them to revisit questions 4 and 9 and amend their review, as we were aware that coaches play a role in advising, for example, and suspected that at least some PE courses might use printed or audio/visual materials. Their responses have been filed with the original report.

Our group also had concerns with PE's response to question #10. They discuss program and class evaluations, but not student achievement or outcomes. We noted as well that very few of the the syllabi on file contained learning objectives. While we are anxious to see student achievement evaluation addressed, our group recognized that it was unrealistic to expect PE to revise their review to address the topic comprehensively this term. Instead, we will meet with them to discuss assessment mechanisms and hope to see better coverage in their next review.

Appendix L: Report on Natural Scientific Approaches Core Review

April 18, 2011

Alyce DeMarais, Tatiana Kaminsky, Alisa Kessel, Amanda Mifflin

The working group analyzed survey responses of faculty in the natural sciences, and facilitated a faculty discussion on February 28, 2011. There were 15 responses to the natural sciences survey, and 6 attendees for the discussion session. The low turnout was due to a conflicting interview seminar in Neuroscience. A summary of responses from the written survey and faculty discussion is given below.

The general consensus was that students were aware of the NS core requirement, but consider it mostly something to be checked off rather than thinking about the significance of why they're taking it. Most faculty assume that the objectives of the core are addressed with students outside of class during orientation and advising meetings, so this is not something that is mentioned much explicitly after the first day or beyond the syllabus.

There was some discussion of whether the objective was worded well. Some thought the terminology was overly broad, but the consensus was that the language was intended to be inclusive of various disciplines of science.

There was some mention in the written survey responses that it was occasionally difficult to have core courses also be major requirements. Some departments have non-major core courses available, but all departments have courses that serve both major requirements and the core. There was some discussion about the pros and cons of courses with mixed major/non-major audiences. Some feel that it is beneficial for non-major students to be around majors that are passionate about the subject, while some have concerns about keeping up the academic integrity of a course to make it accessible to the non-majors. This problem, however, is not specific to core courses and arises for any introductory course. The primary issue for the NS core requirement is that it is not always apparent to students or advisors which courses are geared more towards non-majors. The numbering system can be misleading, with 200-level courses in biology or physics that are appropriate for a non-major, and 100-level courses with prerequisites that are not.

Recommendations

We asked faculty present at the discussion session if the objectives should be re-written or clarified. It was agreed that the objectives were not misleading, were inclusive rather than vague, and that students understood the intent of the core area. The students' selection of an appropriate core course is heavily dependent on advising, so it was suggested that there be a specific section on the core guidelines and objectives in the advising manual. Some guidance regarding the sequencing issues described above would be particularly helpful, such as a list of courses that are appropriate for non-science majors.

Appendix M: Note From Director of Advising Jack Roundy on Sequencing courses in the Approaches Cores

First, a significant advising challenge respecting the NS core, one for which I have not found a magic bullet, is the simultaneous existence of major-oriented and non-major-oriented NS core classes on the one hand, and profound faculty ambivalence about how to advise students respecting these courses on the other. Some faculty strongly believe that we should not have courses designed for non-majors at all—a rigorous liberal arts education should route all students through “real” science courses (another framing with all sorts of complexities of its own). Other faculty think it’s better both for our students to offer discrete and well-distinguished courses for majors and non-majors, and to structure the content and delivery of these courses differently. And there are many variants on these two major themes.

This campus ambivalence makes a unified advising message about the NS rubric very difficult to deliver, because inevitably a unified message will raise hackles on someone’s neck. Add to this fact the faculty determination that “Approaches” core classes may be taken anytime between Year 1 and Year 3, and the problem of sequencing enters into the discussion, as well.

Like all advisors on campus, I can very easily see the advising problem posed by the implicit message in course numbering that the challenging first course in chemistry, Chem 110, represents a less significant challenge than, say, Phys 299, which is designed for non-majors and is probably more accessible to students with a greater variety of academic skills.

I have always thought that if faculty were concerned about the messages sent by course numbering, the answer could be found in re-numbering, as Mathematics chose to do not so long ago (when Calculus 1 was Math 121 and Statistics was Math 271).

If our ambivalence about the coexistence of major and non-major versions of our science offerings were to be resolved by acknowledging and embracing the distinction, then devising an advising office means for articulating options would become easy. It would be made even easier if all non-major offerings were numbered between 100-110, while major versions were numbered higher.

As things stand at this moment, however, I’m not sure how I would formulate an advising recommendation for the new director of advising that did not run the risk of alienating at least one segment of our faculty.

Appendix N: Mathematical Approaches Core Guidelines Changes

Adopted by the Faculty on April 19, 2011

The following language was created by a representative group after consultation with the departments of Math, Computer Science, and Philosophy.

Draft of suggested revisions to Mathematical Approaches core area rubric:

Learning Objectives

Students in Mathematical Approaches courses develop an appreciation of the power of Mathematics and formal methods to provide a way of understanding a problem unambiguously, describing its relation to other problems, and specifying clearly an approach to its solution. Students in Mathematical Approaches courses develop a variety of mathematical skills, an understanding of formal reasoning, and a facility with applications.

Guidelines

1. These goals are met by courses that treat formal reasoning in one or more of the following areas.
 - a. Mathematical reasoning: *The ability to use such techniques as abstraction, definition, symbolic computation, calculation, and proof.*
 - ~~a~~.b. Data-based reasoning: The ability to work with numeric data, to reason from those data, and to understand what can and cannot be inferred from those data;
 - ~~b~~.c. Logical reasoning: The study of formal logic, at least to the extent that is required to understand mathematical proof.
 - d. ~~The algorithmic method~~ Algorithmic reasoning: The ability to analyze a problem, to design a systematic way of addressing that problem using (an algorithm), and to implement that algorithm in a formal language such as a computer programming language.
2. Where these skills or methods are taught within the context of a discipline other than mathematics or computer science, they must receive greater attention than the disciplinary material.

Appendix O: Report and Changes to Independent Study Policy

(Working Group Four: Kessel, DeMarais, Mifflin, Kaminsky)

14 April 2011

Procedure:

- 1) Review of spring 2010 and fall 2010 IS contracts (24 spring; 16 fall).
- 2) Review of IS data by faculty member since summer 2005
- 3) Review of IS units by graduate from 2005-spring 2010 (fall 2010 data is not yet available).
- 4) Meetings with Brad Tomhave (Registrar) and Seth Weinberger (former ASC Chair)

Findings:

- 1) There is a discrepancy regarding the number of hours required for an IS: "Contract" notes 135 hours (9 hours/week); "IS policy" notes 150 (10 hours/week) for 1 unit. There are no listed expectations for .25 or .5 unit courses.
- 2) The problem of "slacker" courses does not seem prevalent. In only one case did a course seem too far-fetched; this case had undergone ASC review due to the student's GPA, and was approved by the ASC.
- 3) At least 9 of the 40 courses appear to be student thesis or seminar projects.
- 4) Faculty load
 - a) Since summer 2005, 386 IS courses have been taught (mean for spring: 42.6; mean for fall: 29.4)
 - b) The Art Department relies on IS more than any other department. Since summer 2005, the Art Department has offered 79 IS courses. Recent changes in the Art Department curriculum seem to have reduced the need for students to take IS: while Art offered 48 IS courses from fall 2006-summer 2008, that number dropped to 17 IS courses from fall 2008-summer 2010.
 - c) 7 instructors have offered a *total* of more than 5 IS courses since summer 2005 (excluding the Art department). Of these, one professor is untenured.
 - d) In 6 instances, since summer 2005, a professor taught 3 IS students at one time. In one instance, an untenured faculty member taught 6 IS in one term.
- 5) Students can count up to 4 IS credits toward their degrees. Since 2005, 372 students have graduated with IS credit. Of these, no student graduated with more than 3.00 units of IS credit. 323 students (87%) graduated with 1.00 unit of IS credit or less.; 367 (99%) graduated with 2.00 units of IS credit or less.
- 6) Thoroughness of proposals varies widely, as do students' expectations about IS (including discrepancies in workload across students seeking partial credit for courses).

Observations from Fall 2010

- 1) At least 6 of the 16 undergrad proposals seem to be research seminars/theses.
- 2) Three instructors are teaching more than one I.S. (Thorndike, Austin, and Brown).
- 3) 1 of 16 courses is for partial credit (MAT program).

Observations from Spring 2010

- 1) At least 3 of the 24 proposals seem to be thesis projects.
- 2) 2 instructors are teaching more than one: Jones (3) and Elliott?-- thermodynamics (2, and these two students seem to have different requirements)

- 3) 7 of 24 are partial credit courses; there are discrepancies in workload across these classes.
- 4) Some classes are housed in departments that may not necessarily be best equipped to teach them.

Recommendations

- 1) Identify uniform hour requirements for 0.25, 0.5, and 1 unit courses. According to Brad Tomhave, there is no official hour requirement for courses. If we use a standard metric, in which a student is expected to work 3 hours outside of class for everyone one hour inside of class, a student should spend about 10 hours/week on each class [$2.5 + (2.5*3)=10$].
- 2) Design a fill-able contract form that requires students to: 1) complete an outline of assignments with weights (most classes have multiple assignments, with no clear articulation of how much each is worth; this could be problematic for both student and instructor down the line), 2) identify a reporting scheme with specific deadlines, and 3) note frequency of meetings with the instructor. Each of these aims to clarify expectations between instructor and student.
- 3) Determine whether IS should be offered P/F: students must not whether they wish to take the course P/F on the contract, which does not accord with the university's policy of protecting anonymity for P/F students.
- 4) Require each department to submit a report every five years *as part of the departmental curriculum review*, listing the IS that were taught (and by whom). The department and CC would then note whether faculty had been unduly burdened, and/or whether additional courses should be added to the departmental curriculum.
- 5) Consider a solution to the IS-as-thesis phenomenon. Students completing thesis projects would most likely benefit from presenting, sharing, and hearing critiques of their work with other students. It may be possible to create a collective course (across multiple departments: a humanistic approaches thesis course, for example) that fulfills this function. Alternatively, we can designate a separate course number that could serve as the "thesis course" across the campus so that student transcripts will reflect the nature of the work they have done (e.g., just as 495/496 is designated as independent study, perhaps 491 could designate an independent thesis/seminar project, and would be listed as such on transcripts).

Policy changes

- 1) Modified independent study contract to include uniform hourly requirement courses for full- and partial-credit courses; to require more detailed information about assignments, meetings, and weights for each assignment in the course grade); to allow the instructor to prevent a student from taking the course Pass/Fail.
- 2) Modified self-study guide for 5-year curriculum review to include discussion of independent study courses and how they fit within the departmental curriculum.

No action taken

- 1) After some discussion, the Curriculum Committee determined that it was beyond the Senate charge regarding changes to the Independent Study contract to create an Independent Thesis option.

Appendix P: Proposed Change to the Curriculum Committee Membership (Library Director)

Adopted by Curriculum Committee on 4/20/2011 with bold and underline approved as addition

Faculty Bylaws

Article V: Standing Committees

Section 6: Standing Committees

B. The Curriculum Committee.

- a. The Committee shall consist of the Dean of the University (ex-officio), Registrar (ex-officio), **Library Director (ex-officio)**, no fewer than seven appointed members of the Faculty, and two student members.
- b. The duties of the Committee shall be:
 1. To apply the educational philosophy and ideals of the University to the undergraduate and graduate curricula offered.
 2. To recommend the degrees to be offered by the University and the specific requirements for those degrees.
 3. To examine proposals for the addition, deletion, or modification of credit or non-credit courses offered through the University.
 4. To establish the specific dates for the academic calendar of the University.
 5. To review plans for study for interdisciplinary majors not under an established program.
 6. To review the curriculum of each department, school, or program at least once every five years.
 7. To review proposals for new majors, minors, and programs.
 8. To monitor the effectiveness of the Core components and initiate reviews of the Core.
 9. Such other duties as may be assigned to it.

Appendix Q: Fall Grades Due Date, email from Brad Tomhave, Registrar

Given the unanticipated problem with the “Livingston Rule” when applied to Fall 2011, we tested a series of calendars from Fall 2002 to Fall 2024 and consulted with Human Resources regarding possible university holidays to verify that amending the rule to allow grades to be due one day later, as the Curriculum Committee did for next year, would be sufficient to adjust the rule for any other possible problem.

We did not find any other problems and to summarize the test results, given that scheduling guidelines require the fall semester to end by December 20, we have 8 possible calendars to consider:

LAST DAY OF FINALS	GRADES DUE	EXAMPLE
Friday, December 13	Thursday, January 2	Fall 2013
Friday, December 14	Wednesday, January 2	Fall 2012
Friday, December 15	Tuesday, January 2	Fall 2006
Friday, December 16	Tuesday, January 3	Fall 2011
Friday, December 17	Monday, January 3	Fall 2010
Friday, December 18	Monday, January 4	Fall 2009
Friday, December 19	Monday, January 5	Fall 2008
Friday, December 20	Monday, January 6	Fall 2002*

Fall 2002 grades were due on Thursday, January 2. Had the “Livingston Rule” been effective then, grades would have been due on Monday, January 6. Following 2002, the next fall semester projected to end on December 20 could be 2019.

To review, the current rule on fall grades reads: “Fall grades are due by noon on the first Monday two weeks after the end of final examinations or on January 2, whichever is later.”

We encountered a problem in Fall 2011, which is characteristic of final examinations ending on December 16, when “the first Monday” and January 2 are the same day and that day is also a university holiday. Therefore, to address the Fall 2011 situation, a rule which reads as follows should be sufficient: “Fall grades are due by noon on the first Monday two weeks after the end of final examinations or on January 2, whichever is later. And, if that due date is a university holiday, then grades will be due at noon on the next business day.”

This can be addressed next year as an update to the calendar guidelines when the Curriculum Committee sets calendar dates.

Brad Tomhave
Registrar

Attachment C
Student Life Committee – Year-End Report

The members of this year's committee were: Peter J Bittner (student), Bill Dasher, Cameron M Ford (student), Bruce Mann, Aislinn Melchior (fall), Geoff Proehl, Lisa Ferrari (Dean's Office), Alyssa M Raymond (student), Mike Segawa (Dean of Students), Nila Wiese (fall), and Stephanie A Wood (student). Peggy Burge attended and participated in discussion as a representative from the Library. The committee met almost every other week.

This year's activities focused on the charges as provided by the Senate and issues presented by the Dean of Students for the committee's advice and consideration. The work of the committee this year was primarily, indeed almost exclusively, to provide opinion and reflections to the Dean regarding campus climate and life. The committee took no actions that require Senate approval or action.

The Senate charged the committee with exploring the university's drug policy (Charge 4). Rather than consider drug use and policy in isolation, the committee explored the broader issue of campus safety. The Security Report did indicate an increase in reported drug use infractions. However, it is not clear whether the increase was due to better monitoring in residential facilities, clearer expectations for enforcement, better detection, or increased drug use. Most of the detected use was for marijuana violation, not for more serious substance abuse and use. Reported alcohol related incidents have declined over the prior year. The Dean of Students' staff reported on the new "Green Dot" program. This program is designed to increase awareness and reporting of harassment problems and to equip students to intervene to prevent situations of concern, as well as aiding in the reporting of other campus security problems. Early indications are that this program has been successful in some cases.

The committee does not see any need for changes in the current drug policy or enforcement activities. The consensus was that the Student Affairs staff are addressing the current issues and are monitoring new approaches to improving campus security, including drug use. The informational programs during orientation appear to be effective in making students aware of appropriate behavior and policies. Drug use infractions, monitored by residential life staff and campus security, are being adjudicated as appropriate under the current Integrity Code regulations. It does not appear that the university has an especially difficult problem that requires new procedures.

The issues of housing, retention, and life on campus consumed a large amount of the committee's attention and time (Charge 1). The Dean reported on the on-going discussions (with faculty, trustees, administrators, and students) concerning the desirability of additional on-campus, university housing. Current university housing is basically at capacity – 93-96% occupied in the fall with some decline in the spring due to students leaving, moving, and studying abroad. The Greek houses are meeting or exceeding their requirement for 90% occupancy. The university currently houses about 60% of the student population. Almost all first year students live on campus (95%), a large fraction

of second year (61%) students are in university housing, but the percentage of third (44%) and fourth year students (24%) living on campus declines dramatically. This potentially skews the nature of on-campus living, interactions, and activities.

Compared to our peer and “aspire to” institutions, we have the lowest on-campus residency rate. The low campus residency rate may also contribute to retention issues, since students living off-campus are less likely to return to complete their degree programs. However, the cause and effect of this relationship has not been clearly established. In addition, because those students living off-campus are less likely to return for evening activities, the mix of students engaged in evening and weekend programs on campus is skewed to first and second year matriculants. Lack of participation by upper-class students may have negative impacts on the quality of co-curricular and social programs.

The current university Strategic and Master Plans envision 75-80% of the student population living on campus. Obviously, this will require the construction of additional university housing. The committee approves this concept and encourages the Trustees to consider making this a high priority in the plan. The Dean has been having discussions with faculty (especially regarding residential life seminars), staff, students, and administrators on what this housing expansion would look like and how it could be accomplished.

The Dean informed the committee about the process and outcome used to select a new fraternity (Sigma Alpha Epsilon) for the university. The number of fraternity houses is now equal to the number of sororities (four). The new house will displace the current Humanities House, but this has been anticipated (if desired, they will most likely move into a residence hall space). There are currently no plans for additional Greek organizations to be invited to campus.

The committee heard an update on the Residential Seminar program. As reported last year, this program is very successful and well-received. The external funding has run its course. The university has opted to continue, through internal allocations, the program with eight to twelve seminars per year. The intention is to integrate the seminars into the residential units, and any new residential facilities will be planned with this as an objective.

The Dean reported on new survey work being done with the sophomore class (part of Charge 3). In general, sophomore students are seriously engaged in the academic program, but report some campus life issues. Time management is one of the more serious issues for these students. Those of the cohort who move off campus, report a lower level of satisfaction. The Student Services staff is beginning to address new initiatives to address these problems and concerns.

The committee explored the issues related to information literacy and academic integrity (Charge 2). Neither the Dean nor the staff responsible for academic integrity believe a serious problem exists. The incidence of active cheating or intentional violations of academic integrity has not increased, and may well have declined somewhat. The problems that now more frequently appear before the staff relate to unintentional violations or behaviors undertaken out of ignorance.

Most often these relate to issues of copyright violations, missing or incomplete citations, and “inadvertent” plagiarism.

The committee heard an extended report by the library liaison about efforts the library has initiated to address this problem. They have created and posted a number of useful resources – for both students and faculty – on-line. Library staff meet with many first year seminars to discuss academic literacy and integrity, and to explain how library resource personnel can be of assistance.

The student members of the committee report that these efforts are useful, but can get lost in the flurry of new information provided early in the first semester.

The Dean and library staff report the problem here is on par with what other schools report. Almost all liberal arts colleges recognize this problem and are creating programs and allocating resources to address the issues. The challenge here is how to make the programs effective with a sustained impact.

The library staff and the Dean’s office are exploring the way information is presented during orientation, working more intensively with the first year seminar program, and considering ways to use residential life staff to help students.

While the Student Life Committee did not believe it was the appropriate body to formulate policy in the area of academic integrity and information literacy, it does believe this is an important concern that requires attention and probably resources.

The committee met with Czarina Ramsay (Director of Multicultural Student Services) and Dean Segawa to consider the mission of multicultural programs and services on campus (Charges 7 and 8). Both reported that organized programs and support for student groups are in place and working well. More than a dozen student groups, from across the cultural spectrum, receive guidance, staff support, and programming assistance. The particular groups do change from year, but the overall nature of this effort appears to be successful.

What is needed now, according to Student Affairs staff and students, is more directed mentoring for students from non-majority and under-represented populations. Thus, work in this area has shifted to more training, personal interactions, meetings, and outreach to appropriate student populations. This is a change in approach from directly encouraging organized activities for groups to working with students more directly and individually. The objective is to reduce the sense of isolation some students experience and to help students discover appropriate ways to define their identities.

Students appear to want more discussion and communication about diversity and identity issues both in and out of the classroom. The Student Services staff is considering ways to expand opportunities in this area beyond the Orientation programming and first year outreach efforts.

It appears this shift from organizational and formal programming to more individualized communication and mentoring is occurring nationally on campuses. Puget Sound is at the forefront of this effort. The committee recommends that this issue remain on the agenda for next year.

The committee did not consider the efficacy of having a member serve on ASUPS Senate (Charge 5). This does not seem to be a significant concern, and perhaps is not appropriate to the work of this committee. This could be revisited in the future.

Issues that should be continued by next year's committee are: housing plans, faculty involvement with improving retention, the campus culture for underrepresented students, and information literacy issues.

After reviewing the discussions this year, considering the data presented by the Student Services staff, and consulting with the Dean of Students, the committee affirms:

1. That the Dean of Students and the staff of Student Affairs should continue to work on programs to enhance the sophomore year experience,
2. That the university should plan for and construct a new on-campus residential facility, and
3. That the university should implement a two year (first and second) on-campus residency policy.

The committee also explored the idea of a "quarter unit activity credit" for participation in programs that deal with multi-cultural engagement, community involvement, and/or information literacy. The sense of the committee was that this could provide a useful academic option for students, encourage discussions regarding these issues, and provide an incentive for students to become more actively engaged.

Respectfully submitted,

Bruce Mann, Chair, Student Life Committee

Attachment D

Library, Media, and Information Systems Committee (LMIS)
Faculty Senate Report
May 2, 2011

2010-2011 LMIS Membership:

Alyce DeMarais (ex officio), Tim Hoyt, Pierre Ly, Jennifer Neighbors (Fall 2010), Mark Reinitz (Chair), Jason Sawin, Jeff Tepper, Ariela Tubert, Jane Carlin(ex officio), William Morse (ex officio), Cindy Riche (ex officio), Meredith Fall (student), Kristin Johnson (Senate liaison)

The ongoing duties of the LMIS committee as described in the Faculty Bylaws are:

To develop general policies, procedures and plans in collaboration with Library

staff and Technology Services. To provide recommendations and advice to all part of the university community on the role of the library, media and information systems in support of the academic program. To review periodically the mission and objectives of the library and information systems and to recommend changes as needed. To review periodically the collection development plan for the library to ensure that a balanced collection is maintained for effective support of the academic program.

The specific charges for the 2010-1011 LMIS Committee from faculty senate were:

1. Develop and implement print management educational materials.
2. Review copyright policy and protocols.
3. Revise intellectual property policy.
4. Assist Technology Services in training and transitioning faculty to Moodle.

Overview of committee activities

The committee met biweekly. Parts of most meetings involved presentations or updates from various constituencies eager to receive faculty feedback or to disseminate information to the faculty about various library or information-systems projects or initiatives. Jane Carlin gave regular updates on library initiatives. Committee members provided feedback and helped disseminate information regarding events such as the Edible Book competition. Committee members were particularly involved in helping to identify ways to enhance information literacy for our first year students, for instance through the possible inclusion of segments in first-year seminars and the creation of web pages hosted by the library. The committee played an active role in several ongoing efforts in Information Systems. For instance, committee members attended demonstrations of ERP systems and provided input to the CTO regarding this important purchase and implementation. In this case committee members unanimously endorsed the need for a new ERP system, noting that our current systems are out of date and inefficient. We also reviewed and provided comments on a draft revision of Technology Services policies. We identified and implemented various ways to alert faculty to new technologies emerging on campus, such as the Sound Ideas repository and the SoundNet SharePoint site, both of which are currently in limited use as they are being beta tested.

Work to address faculty senate charges

Subcommittees were created to work on the following charges. They brought their work to the full committee for periodic discussion. This work is described below.

Print Management Issues

The university plans to implement a print management system that will keep track of the number of pages printed by members of the University community.

The goal is to reduce unnecessary printing. Print management issues were part of the agenda of almost every LMIS meeting, and LMIS communicated with the Print Management Taskforce to help determine exactly what features we desired in a print management system. A specific system will be chosen over

the summer. Once print management is implemented the University plans to set a limit on the number of free pages that each student can print without charge.

The committee engaged in an ongoing effort to determine an appropriate limit.

As part of this effort the committee created a print-use survey that was recently distributed to all faculty members by faculty senate. Once limits are determined it will be a challenge to educate students and faculty about them. The committee noted that one way to keep printing costs down is for faculty to more commonly use course packets in their classes. These are ongoing issues that will need active attention in the next academic year.

Copyright Issues

The committee engaged in several discussions regarding copyright issues. It quickly became clear to the committee that copyright issues are a moving target as the law is literally being made on a daily basis. Various efforts were made to update University copyright policies and to make them more broadly available to faculty. Jane Carlin worked with Lori Ricigliano to update copyright information on the library website and an effort was begun by Alyce DeMarais to arrange for copyright information to be distributed by the bookstore along with textbook order forms. Again, copyright policies are likely to evolve rapidly and will require continued attention by the committee.

Intellectual Property Policy Revision

The subcommittee was successful in producing a revised intellectual property policy document that was forwarded to the full committee for comment and discussion. The document deals with such issues as right of ownership in various situations, such as when faculty produce profitable materials while working at the University, when faculty create materials in collaboration with students, and so on. Committee members perceived the document as fair and equitable. At our final meeting the revised document was unanimously approved and will go forward for further review.

Transition to Moodle

Most committee involvement with this process took the form of updates from Educational Technology personnel who seemed to have a well-thought-out plan for the migration. It appeared that the migration went smoothly and that faculty received repeated contacts from Educational Technologies staff informing them of the switch and offering training.

Suggested charges for next academic year

1. The charge as stated in the faculty bylaws is appropriate: LMIS serves as a way for faculty to quickly alert Library and Technology staff to important issues, and provides those staff members with a way to get quick faculty feedback about proposed changes and initiatives.
2. Print management: Many issues will need to be addressed with the rollout of the print management system. Especially notable is the need to educate faculty and students in a way that is supportive.
3. Copyright issues. As noted these policies are constantly evolving. There is an ongoing need to provide faculty with relevant information as these changes occur.
4. Communication and input regarding major technology initiatives:

Technology Services plans to move towards virtual desktops, where “thin clients” will replace some existing University computers. There will be a need to inform faculty about these changes as well as an opportunity for faculty to provide input. In addition, the E-repository project and the new campus intranet are new and important aspects of technology on campus and it will be important to inform faculty about their existence and potential uses.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Tippens Reinitz
Professor and LMIS Chair