

Minutes of the September 23, 2013 University of Puget Sound Faculty Meeting

1. President Ron Thomas called the meeting to order at about 4:00 pm. A list of those attending (from a sign-in sheet circulated during the meeting) is given in Appendix I.
2. M/S/P to elect Martin Jackson as Faculty Secretary for 2013-14.
3. M/S/P to approve the minutes of the April 15 2013 faculty meeting.
4. Announcements
 - Alyce DeMarais noted that a sheet was circulating to record attendance per faculty action approved last year.
5. President's Report
 - President Thomas reported that the Board of Trustee has formed an enrollment workgroup to be convened in October and work over next year. The work group will include two faculty representatives. Enrollment success this year indicates opportunities for choices on factors such as class composition and financial aid.
6. Academic Vice President's Report
 - Academic Vice President Bartanen thanked all for getting the new academic year off to a good start.
 - The Northwest Five College Consortium annual meeting will take place September 27-29. Twelve faculty colleagues will join Kris Bartanen, Sunil Kukreja, and Roy Robinson in attending the meeting.
 - The Pacific Northwest Learning Conference will hold a two-day workshop "Student Learning in the Liberal Arts: Assessment and Improvement" at Pacific Lutheran University on November 15 and 16.
7. Faculty Senate Chair report
 - Senate Chair Dillman noted that the Senate has four new elected members and will have three appointed replacements. Alisa Kessel will serve again as Vice Chair and Nila Weise will serve as Secretary.
 - The Senate Executive Committee worked with Deans on service assignments including increases in size of IRB and Student Life to meet increased responsibilities. Gerard Morris deserves particular thanks for agreeing to serve as faculty representative to the ASUPS Senate, which requires attending evening meetings.
 - At the Senate August retreat, the two most significant issues discussed were consulting with Mike Segawa in establishing a First Year Experience Task Force and finding ways for additional attention, analysis, and awareness regarding sexual violence on campus.
 - In the first Senate meeting of the year, charges to two committees were approved. These included renewing a charge to the ASC to revisit the course schedule framework and charging the SLC to evaluate the residential seminar program.
8. Revised policy recommendations regarding first-year seminars were introduced by Tatiana Kaminsky in her role as chair of the Curriculum Committee (CC) for 2012-13.
 - Professor Kaminsky reported that in its work last year on first-year seminars, the CC considered a set of policy recommendations generated by the First-Year

Seminar Policy Subcommittee (articulated in a March 30, 2012 memo). After revising Recommendations 9 and 17 (as indicated in the attached document), the CC approved bringing a version of the policy recommendations forward to the full faculty.

- M/S/vote reported later to adopt the policy recommendations in the attached document.
 - Heidi Orloff noted that “off-cycle” seminars often have a large proportion of students who have previously failed a seminar and asked if we can have a policy or process to avoid this.
 - M/S/vote reported later amend the motion by removing Recommendation 17
 - In making the motion, Bill Breitenbach argued that we should teach the students we have. In opposing the motion, Harry Velez-Quinones argued that the current wording limits exposure of those faculty members who are more vulnerable. Suzanne Holland noted she is sympathetic to protecting junior faculty but would rather see this handled at the department level. Julie Christoph noted that the CC’s rewording privileges a faculty perspective whereas the original wording was about student perspective. In supporting the motion Keith Ward argued that the evaluation process looks at a record comprehensively. Amy Spivey reported that the CC working group that looked at the policy recommendations had discussions about both protecting students and discouraging departments from assigning visiting faculty members to seminars. Denise Despres asked if have we looked at a breakdown of who teaches seminars. Tatiana Kaminsky reminded that Recommendation 17 applies only to off-cycle seminars rather than to all seminars. Bill Barry asked how the recommendation would work in practice. Lisa Ferrari replied that the Associate Deans Office looks for good fit for off-cycle seminars and that in the CC discussions, she asked for clearer direction on a meaning of “more experienced faculty” wording in the original policy recommendation.
 - The President called for vote on the motion to amend. After voice vote was not conclusive, vote by show of hand resulted in 21 in favor, 45 opposed so motion the motion to amend failed.
 - Priti Joshi asked if the CC could rework the wording of Recommendation 17 to bring back the student perspective but withdrew the suggestion after Bill Barry noted that this was a relatively straightforward recommendation that should not take up more time.
 - M/S/P to amend the motion by striking Item 1 from Recommendation 17. In making the motion, Robin Jacobson noted that the other items provide sufficient guidance to the Associate Deans Office.
 - The President called for a vote on the main motion, which passed on a voice vote.
9. M/S/vote reported later to approve changes to the Fine Arts Approaches Core rubric as detailed on the attached document.
- In making the motion, Terry Beck noted that the CC review of the Fine Arts Approaches two years ago resulted in recommendations that did not make it to the full faculty. This is being corrected by bringing a motion forward now. One

recommendation is to rename as this Core area as Artistic Approaches to clarify content for students and be consistent with other Approaches titles. Another recommendation is a rewording of the learning objectives to emphasize critical thinking aspects of courses. The final recommendation is to revise the guidelines in order to clarify that courses involving creation of art can be part of this Core area.

- Hearing no discussion, the President called for a vote and the motion passed by voice.
10. M/S/no action taken yet to adopt a Knowledge, Identity, and Power overlay as a graduation requirement as detailed on the attached document
- In presenting the motion, Doug Cannon noted that he is not part of the working group that developed the proposal; he asked to make motion in order to speak to it on personal terms and to give wider perspective. He relayed several personal experiences that make him question the progress we have made in providing a welcoming environment for students from historically underrepresented populations. He also wonders about the effectiveness of our current curriculum in preparing our current students for their experiences in a diverse world. Does our current curriculum fully support our stated mission (which includes developing rich knowledge of self and others) and our stated education goals? He noted the heritage of the university as founded by Methodist church that has a social gospel consistent with our mission statement emphasizing the importance of developing an acknowledged set of personal values and argued that none of this entails the imposition of a particular ideology but does entail open discourse. Finally, he noted that, unlike other curricular proposals, this one comes from student initiatives such as one six years ago that he took part in as Faculty Senate Chair. A recent discussion of this proposal by student leaders as part of the Diversity Summit produced almost no dissent. He then yielded the floor to three members of the working group who would present additional background and details.
 - Amy Ryken, Dexter Gordon, and Carolyn Weisz presented from the attached slides.
 - Amy Ryken began with a history of the proposal including work of the Committee on Diversity resulting from a Senate charge and Summer 2013 efforts of a work group funded by a Burlington Northern award. She argued for the importance of a requirement and for the two-unit structure.
 - Dexter Gordon noted that the overlay design was consistent with student and faculty feedback, did not add to the total number of units required for graduation, is budget neutral, frames issues as integrated throughout the curriculum, is aligned with our mission and curriculum statements, and provides opportunities for creative and collaborative pedagogy.
 - Carolyn Weisz reviewed the learning objectives included in the motion noting that these would be common elements for all courses in the overlay. She also noted an initial draft of rubric guidelines that are included on handout.

- In response to a question from Nick Kontogeorgopolis as to why this proposal did not go through the CC first and then on to the full faculty rather simultaneous consideration, Doug Cannon noted that, historically, general core requirements usually go through full faculty first. He also clarified that the motion does not include the draft guidelines, which could be worked through by the CC if the faculty adopts the overlay.
- In regard to the third learning objective, Derek Buescher commented that this is a worthy outcome but difficult to do in practice. Amy Ryken noted that students bring this idea up in the form of questions such as “how do I think of myself and others” and “how do I act in this situation”. Derek Buescher commented about the potential limitation in phrasing “locate their own social position” as singular.
- Denise Despres asked if students express interest in service learning and did the work group consider service learning as part of the proposed requirement. Amy Ryken responded that, yes, students describe those opportunities as rich learning experiences, both on and off campus. Nancy Bristow noted that mandating a service learning experience for all students could be problematic but would welcome allowing it as an option.
- Brad Dillman pointed out that this motion has not gone through a normal process of curricular review: the CC has never discussed this motion or proposal and no minutes have been made available to Senate from Committee on Diversity discussion. He argued that for real faculty governance, the faculty must rely on standing committees to vet proposals before discussion and vote by the full faculty. In order to respect the faculty governance process, he wants the CC to review the proposal and then bring it to the Senate to review, giving both groups opportunity to present views. Suzanne Holland disagreed that the current process is not appropriate, noting that any person can bring up any item in this forum or in Senate.
- Suzanne Holland declared herself to be sympathetic to the proposal. She asked two questions: Will this result in a burden on those who teach courses that would naturally be consider for inclusion in the overlay? Could we replace Connections with part of this? Nick Kontogeorgopolis wondered if everyone who teaches a course that might fit would want it to be included and also wondered if restricting focus to contemporary US life (Guideline 2.d) would be too restrictive. He agreed that students, when asked, would want more diversity in curriculum but wondered what student reaction is to this specific proposal. In reference to Doug Cannon’s opening remarks, he asked if this proposal makes Puget Sound a less lonely place for certain individuals? He also noted that if we don’t have enough courses satisfying the overlay, then this becomes more like an additional Core category. He expressed sympathy toward the idea of the proposal but uncertainty about the details.
- Harry Velez-Quinones emphasized that this is an overlay, noting that the work group has thought about how to make this feasible. He noted that in his own experience teaching literature and culture of Spain, he has no problem finding relevant issues in the content and making parallels to contemporary US life. He expressed confidence that we can make this work.

- Stacey Weiss posed two questions: Of the roughly 40 courses identified as potentially satisfying the overlay, how many are Core or upper-division requirements? Will this proposal have the advertised curricular benefits? She suggested that this second question could be tested by comparing students who have already taken courses potentially satisfying the requirement with those who have not.
- Carolyn Weisz offered two comments. First, in response to questions about process, she noted that she was on the CC two years ago when charge came from Senate to look at this issue and that the charge was moved to the Committee on Diversity so this has gone through a faculty governance process. She also noted that this is a first reading so there is opportunity for the CC and Senate to weigh in, and that the work group will continue to incorporate feedback into the working draft of the rubric guidelines. Second, she noted that designing this as a graduation requirement ensures every student takes these courses; those students who are normally too busy to take these courses would be most affected and this is what would transform the conversation.
- Dexter Gordon responded to an earlier question posed by Nick Kontogeorgopolis by pointing out that in all responses, no students expressed concern about a burden.
- President Thomas noted that the discussion could not continue without a motion to extend the meeting time. Hearing none, he invited a motion to adjourn.

11. M/S/P to adjourn.

Respectfully submitted by Martin Jackson, Faculty Secretary

Attendees

Anderson-Connelly, Rich
Barkin, Gareth
Barry, Bill
Bartanen, Kris
Beardsley, Bill
Beck, Terry
Benitez, Michael
Breitenbach, Bill
Bristow, Nancy
Brody, Nick
Brown, Gwynne
Buescher, Derek
Burgard, Dan
Butcher, Alva
Cannon, Douglas
Christoph, Julie
DeHart, Monica
DeMarais, Alyce
DeMotts, Rachel
Despres, Denise
Dillman, Brad
Elliott, Joel
Evans, Jim
Ferrari, Lisa
Fisher, Amy
Fox-Dobbs, Kena
Gordon, Dexter
Grinstead, Jeff
Haltom, Bill
Hamel, Fred
Hanson, John
Hastings, Jennifer
Holland, Suzanne
Hooper, Kent
Irvin, Darcy
Jackson, Martin
Jacobson, Robin
Johnson, Kristin
Johnson, Lisa
Joshi, Priti
Kaminsky, Tatiana
Kessel, Alisa
Kim, Jung
Kontogeorgopoulos, Nick
Kotsis, Kriszta

Krause, Alan
Krueger, Pat
Kukreja, Sunil
Latimer, David
Lewin, Ben
Livingston, Grace
Looper, Julia
Marcavage, Janet
Martin, Mark
McCall, Gary
McMillian, Danny
Mifflin, Amanda
Morse, Lindsay
Neshyba, Steven
Odegard, Amy
Orloff, Heidi
Owen, Susan
Proehl, Geoff
Richards, Brad
Richman, Elise
Rickoll, Wayne
Rodgers, Steve
Rogers, Brett
Ryken, Amy
Segawa, Mike
Shapiro, Sara
Sherman, Dan
Smith, Adam
Sousa, David
Spivey, Mike
Spivey, Amy
Stockdale, Johathan
Thomas, Ron
Utrata, Jennifer
Valentine, Mike
Velez, Harry
Walls, Kurt
Ward, Keith
Weiss, Stacey
Weisz, Carolyn
Williams, Linda
Wilson, Paula
Wilson, Ann
Wimberger, Peter

Guests

Carlin, Jane
Peters, Ellen
Tomhave, Brad
Wade, Landon

First-year seminar policy recommendations to the Curriculum Committee

Received: March 30, 2012

Accepted with revisions: November 27, 2012.

[Revisions are in points 9 and 17, and are underlined.]

To: Curriculum Committee

From: First-Year Seminar Policy Subcommittee (Bill Barry, Derek Buescher, Peggy Burge, Julie Christoph, Eric Orlin, Amy Spivey, Brad Tomhave, Landon Wade)

New rubrics for the first-year seminars (which will be called Seminar in Scholarly Inquiry 1 and 2) were approved by the full faculty in October 2011 and will go into effect in Fall 2013. This memo serves as a set of recommendations for academic policy and practice related to the new seminars.

This subcommittee is comprised of a subset of the faculty members and librarians who were in the Burlington Northern First-Year Seminar Working Group that crafted the new seminar rubrics, along with Landon Wade, Director of Academic Advising, and Brad Tomhave, Registrar. After soliciting input from the full faculty on these policy questions, this group met several times over the spring of 2012 to craft the following recommendations.

General recommendations

1. Regarding course naming and numbering, we recommend that non-departmental numbering be used for the seminars (e.g. SSI1 105, SSI2 137), but that some indication of the home department of the faculty member teaching the course should be provided either in the name of the course or in the course description that appears on the online registration system (currently Cascade).
2. SSI1 will be primarily offered in the fall, and SSI2 will be primarily offered in the spring. A few (e.g. two or three) off-cycle sections of each type of seminar will be offered each semester, and one or two sections of each type of seminar could be offered in the summer, as well.
3. If an SSI1 course and an SSI2 course are built around the same content, they should be given the same course number (SSI1 137 and SSI2 137, for example). The online registration system (currently Cascade) will prevent students from registering for SSI courses having the same number.

Recommendations pertinent to all students

4. Students must successfully complete SSI1 before taking SSI2.
5. Students who wish to drop an SSI course must obtain a drop code from the instructor and process it through the Registrar's office. This is in line with current practice for first-year seminar courses.

6. Students may receive credit for only one SSI1 course and only one SSI2 course. (For example, if a student does poorly in an SSI1 course, he or she may choose to take a second SSI1 course, but the second course credit and grade will replace the credit and grade from the first SSI1 course.)

Recommendations pertinent to transfer students

7. Transfer students may receive transfer credit for SSI1, provided that they have taken a first-year writing course that includes a significant focus on argument-based writing in an academic context. That is the minimum standard to be used by the Registrar's office in determining whether a course taken elsewhere should count for SSI1.

8. Transfer students may choose to count courses taken at other institutions that satisfy the requirements for SSI1 as elective credit or as credit for SSI1.

9. Transfer students may not normally count courses taken at other institutions toward SSI2, though are allowed to appeal for previously taken courses to be considered for this requirement.

10. Transfer students will no longer be segregated into "Transfer Sections" of the seminars in the fall term. They will be free to register for any open seminar section.

Recommendations pertinent to freshmen

11. Freshmen will continue to be placed in fall SSI1 seminars by the Registrar using the students' stated preferences, as is the current practice. In the spring, freshmen will register themselves for SSI courses during the registration period, as is the current practice.

Recommendations pertinent to faculty teaching the seminars

12. Faculty members are encouraged to submit proposals for both SSI1 and SSI2 using the same content but different sets of assignments. To facilitate proposals of paired SSI1 and SSI2 courses, the Curriculum Proposal Form for Core Courses should be amended to remove the Seminar in Writing and Rhetoric and the Seminar in Scholarly and Creative Inquiry check boxes. Three new check boxes should be added: "Seminar in Scholarly Inquiry 1," "Seminar in Scholarly Inquiry 2," and "Seminars in Scholarly Inquiry 1 and 2 (seminars based on the same content but with different assignments)."

13. Faculty proposing SSI1 and SSI2 syllabi together should submit materials for both seminars, along with a single form and a single cover letter explaining how the courses fulfill the rubric of the Core category, as well as specifically how the two syllabi differ.

14. When the Curriculum Committee is ready to accept proposals for the SSIs, the approved rubric should be added to the Curriculum Guidelines and Forms page on the Puget Sound Web site. It would also be helpful to add a "Frequently Asked Questions" page, at least for the transitional years of 2012-2013 and 2013-2014.

15. Instructors who are teaching SSI courses should include in their syllabi the learning objectives as given in the seminar rubrics.

16. Instructors who are teaching SSI courses should include in their syllabi a list of places for students to seek help with research and writing skills, including the Center for Writing, Learning, and Teaching and the Collins Library liaison librarians.

17. The Associate Deans ~~should ask more experienced faculty~~ would prefer:

1. faculty not being evaluated and/or

2) faculty who are tenured and/or

3) faculty who have taught SSI courses recently

to teach the off-cycle seminars, since the off-cycle seminars will likely include a more challenging group of students (students who failed a previous SSI course, incoming transfer students, and so forth).

**Proposed changes to Fine Arts Approaches core area rubric
Approved by the Curriculum Committee, September 25, 2012**

[Changes appear in **bold**]

FINE ARTS ARTISTIC APPROACHES RUBRIC

LEARNING OBJECTIVES

Students in **Fine Arts Artistic** Approaches courses ~~acquire an understanding and appreciation of an artistic tradition and develop their skills in the critical analysis of art.~~ **develop a critical, interpretive, and analytical understanding of art through the study of an artistic tradition.**

GUIDELINES

- I. The Fine Arts include the visual, performing, and literary arts. Courses in **Fine Arts Artistic** Approaches may either be ~~in the history of art or in artistic creation.~~ **historical or creative in emphasis.**
- II. Courses in **Fine Arts Artistic** Approaches examine significant developments ~~and in~~ representative works of an artistic tradition.

These courses ~~introduce students to methods of aesthetic and formal analysis~~ **provide opportunities for informed engagement with an artistic tradition** and require students to reflect critically, both orally and in writing, about art and the creative process.

I move that the faculty adopt an overlay requirement for the baccalaureate degree under the title “Knowledge, Identity, and Power”, comprising one lower-division course and one upper-division course, meeting the following learning objectives:

Learning Objectives

In these courses, students learn to:

- acquire an understanding of the dynamics and consequences of disparity, power, and privilege (these can include individual, institutional, cultural, and structural dynamics);
- participate productively in critical conversations about the topics above; and
- locate their own social position and examine a range of possible actions in response to issues of justice and identity in personal, academic, and civic lives.

Guidelines for the requirement have been proposed. A procedure for adopting, modifying, or reformulating guidelines will be determined upon passage of this motion.

Douglas Cannon
Professor of Philosophy
September 23, 2013

Proposed Overlay Requirement Knowledge, Identity and Power

Faculty Meeting
September 23, 2013

Motion

- ▶ I move that the faculty adopt an overlay requirement for the baccalaureate degree under the title “Knowledge, Identity, and Power”, comprising one lower-division course and one upper-division course, meeting the following learning objectives:

Learning Objectives

In these courses, students learn to:

- acquire an understanding of the dynamics and consequences of disparity, power, and privilege (these can include individual, institutional, cultural, and structural dynamics);
- participate productively in critical conversations about the topics above; and
- locate their own social position and examine a range of possible actions in response to issues of justice and identity in personal, academic, and civic lives.

Faculty Senate Charges

- ▶ Research whether and how peer and next step institutions integrate a diversity requirement in the curriculum
- ▶ Make recommendations to the Senate or full faculty about integrating a diversity component into the curriculum.

Committee on Diversity Analysis

- ▶ Review of peer, next step, premier, and non-peer institutions
- ▶ Review of departmental 5-year curriculum review statements
- ▶ Review of 2009 inventory of diversity courses
- ▶ Review of National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) data
- ▶ Shared and solicited feedback (Faculty Senate, Curriculum Committee, Chairs, Deans & Directors, Wed @ 4, Student Diversity Governing Council, Student Leaders)

Burlington Northern Analysis

- ▶ Work Group
 - Review of written feedback from students and faculty
 - Review of focus group notes provided by the Office of Institutional Research
 - Drafted proposal and rubric
- ▶ Feedback Group
 - Reviewed and discussed proposal and rubric
- ▶ Work Group
 - Revised proposal and rubric and circulated. Circulated proposal to solicit feedback.

Why a Requirement?

- ▶ 25% of first year students and seniors indicate seldom or never to: “Diverse perspectives (e.g., different races, religions, genders, political belief, etc.) were often included in class discussion or writing assignments” (NSSE, 2004–2011).
- ▶ Students respond that their experiences at Puget Sound have “somewhat” (2.5 average) contributed to their knowledge, skills, and personal development regarding understanding people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds. (NSSE, 2011)

Why a 2-unit Requirement?

- ▶ Office of Institutional Research Focus Groups with Seniors
 - Classes need to happen earlier and later; desire for exposure to topics prior to junior year
 - To develop skills to communicate regarding similarities and differences
 - To be aware and critical regarding current issues
 - To have an introduction to and build competence in engaging dynamics and consequences of disparity

Staffing Considerations

- ▶ Implemented Over Time
 - 2015–2016: 15 courses
 - 2016–2017: 30 courses
 - 2017–2018: 45 courses
 - 2018–2019: 60 courses (full implementation)

Why an Overlay Requirement?

- ▶ Responds to student and faculty feedback by not adding to the total number of graduation requirements
- ▶ Budget neutral in terms of staffing
- ▶ Frames study of inequalities and contrasting visions of social justice as interwoven with disciplinary and interdisciplinary knowledge

Alignment with Mission Statement

- ▶ the encouragement of “a rich knowledge of self and others; an appreciation of commonality and difference; the full, open, and civil discussion of ideas; thoughtful moral discourse; and...preparing the university’s graduates to meet the highest tests of democratic citizenship.”

Alignment with Curriculum Statement

- ▶ “deepening students understanding of the structures and issues of the contemporary world, broadening their perspective on enduring human concerns and cultural change” and supporting students “to cope with the complexity of modern life.”

Opportunity for Growth and Creative Thinking

- ▶ Opportunities for creative and collaborative pedagogy
- ▶ Distinguish our curriculum and pedagogies
- ▶ Resources for course development

Learning Objectives

In these courses, students learn to:

- acquire an understanding of the dynamics and consequences of disparity, power, and privilege (these can include individual, institutional, cultural, and structural dynamics);
- participate productively in critical conversations about the topics above; and
- locate their own social position and examine a range of possible actions in response to issues of justice and identity in personal, academic, and civic lives.

Rubric Guidelines

- ▶ The courses promote critical engagement with the causes, nature, and consequences of individual, institutional, cultural, and/or structural dynamics of disparity, power, and privilege.
- ▶ These courses provide opportunities for students to:
 - engage critically in thoughtful moral discourse
 - recognize the value of both analytic and affective modes of learning and knowing
 - locate their own social positions and see the relational and multifaceted quality of identities
 - connect course themes to the disparities that mark contemporary U.S. life
- ▶ Courses meeting the requirement can be designated within existing core areas, graduation requirements, majors, minors, and emphasis programs, and/or in other full credit offerings such as internships and independent studies.
- ▶ Courses will be guided by at least two of the framing questions.