

University of Puget Sound Faculty Senate Meeting
October 6, 2014
McCormick Room, Library

Chair Tubert called the meeting to order at 4:02 pm.

Present: Derek Buescher, Andrew Gardner, Bill Haltom, Zaixin Hong, Judith Kay, Sunil Kukreja, Brendan Lanctot, Paige Maney, Emelie Peine, Maria Sampen, Leslie Saucedo, Shirley Skeel, Chris Spalding, Jonathan Stockdale, Ariela Tubert, Nila Wiese

Announcements:

Tubert solicited agenda items for the faculty meeting on October 13, 2014. In the meeting, Saucedo, Sampen, and Tubert will discuss the faculty governance survey results.

Tubert solicited agenda items for next Senate meeting. Considering that the first meeting of the Faculty Compensation Task Force was held today, she requested regular updates to the Senate from the members of the Faculty Salary Committee that serve on the task force.

Approval of Minutes:

M/S/P to accept the minutes of September 22nd, 2014 as revised.

Tubert noticed an error in the proposed charge #4 for UEC included in the minutes of September 8, 2014. The minutes included the word “UEC” but the senate vote did not include “UEC” when approved. Charge #4 was subsequently amended on September 22nd to add the word “UEC” but the amendment was by mistake added back to the September 8th minutes.

With the approval of Chair Tubert, Haltom distributed copies of a chapter from the Sturgis guide to parliamentary procedure (4th ed. 2001, pp. 198-201, Chapter 23 “Minutes”). This chapter details what must be included in minutes, what need not be included, and which inclusions are discretionary.

Charges to Committees:

Academic Standards Committee:

Haltom presented the proposed charges to the Academic Standards Committee.

After a detailed deliberation on the proposed charge #1 [Continue consideration of options for revisions of the framework for course schedules with the goals of 1) meeting the preferences of faculty (for example, rethinking the balance of scheduling courses for two, three, or four days per week), 2) using available campus spaces more efficiently, 3) maintaining some commitment to curricular and co-curricular program offerings between 4:00 and 6:00 p.m., and 4) locating a common hour. **Rationale:** The ASC considered this matter at its meeting on 20 September 2013 and in its year-end report asked that the Senate repeat this charge to the ASC for 2014-2015], the charge was deferred to future meetings of Faculty Senate.

Kay suggested the clarification of charge #2. Haltom made the revision, which reads: “Review the revisions made by the Offices of the Registrar and Admissions of the published materials made available to prospective students regarding the University’s transfer of Running Start credit policy.” Regarding charge #2, Stockdale asked what the rationale is for having the Offices of the Registrar and Admissions review the published materials made available to prospective students. Kukreja mentioned that based on the ASC’s experience with a student petition that addressed the concern, the ASC believes the charge would help make the University’s transfer of Running Start credit policy more transparent.

In regard to charge #3 [Consider University policies related to accepting transfer credits either from incoming students or from students already matriculated at Puget Sound (including transfer of credits from community college beyond the current “junior status” of 16 units or inclusion of exam scores from the Cambridge Advanced International Certificate of Education in the grouping with current AP and IB transfer credits)], the wording “revising” was added after “Consider”. Sampen noted that more international students would have similar concerns.

After the discussion on charge #5 [Consider revision of the incomplete policies in regard to under what circumstances to assign an incomplete and how to determine appropriate time to allow for completion. **Rationale:** The ASC in its year-end report asked that the Senate so charge the ASC for 2014-2015], Haltom made a revision, which reads: “Clarify and consider revising of the incomplete grade policies.” Regarding charge #5, Kukreja mentioned that just as in the case of a student medical withdraw resulting from a situation when the student is studying abroad in a third party program, there is ambiguity regarding the criteria for assigning incomplete grades. The charge is to address this ambiguity.

Regarding the rationale of charge #6 [Looking back over the work of the committee during the 2014-15 academic year, indicate in your end of year report whether the size of the committee was appropriate and identify any committee work that seemed superfluous. **Rationale:** The Senate is eager for each senate committee to assess size and activity], Tubert noted that the Senate had already passed on the message for each senate committee to assess size and activity. Saucedo concurred.

M/S/P moved to accept charges 2-6 as revised.

Professional Standards Committee:

Buescher presented the proposed charges to the Professional Standards Committee.

Regarding charge #2 [Create a cycle of review for department and program faculty evaluation standards and criteria. a. **Rationale:** There exists no standing process by which departments and programs regularly review their standards of evaluation], Tubert confirmed with Buescher that no minor changes will be made in the cycle unless PSC reviews the whole entity of department and program faculty evaluation standards and criteria.

In regard to charge #5 [Communicate with departments regarding the new interpretation to the Faculty Code on Visiting lines and their participation in faculty evaluations]. Buescher noted that

the PSC had discussed this charge already and that email communication from the Dean was sufficient. Bartanen noted that these changes would require departments to update their departmental evaluation standards.

Regarding charge #6 [Review and consider endorsement of evaluation guidelines for faculty digital scholarship. a. **Rationale:** As digital scholarship becomes a more common component of faculty professional growth, it is desirable for Puget Sound to implement guidelines for evaluation of such work], Buescher mentioned that Dean Bartanen provided a template (see appendix example enclosed in the minutes below). Peine noted that these guidelines were mentioned in the faculty meeting; she asked if it should be included in the department faculty evaluation guidelines. Buescher replied that he would acquire more information for an answer. Tubert seconded the removal of “endorsement of” from the proposed charge.

Based on his experience as a department head, Buescher proposed charge #7 [Review the PSC “Unified interpretation of Chapter III, Sections 4, a (1) and 4, a (c). Letters of Evaluation from Persons Outside the Department” to determine if the language on outside letters should be updated for: (a) distinctions of submission process for different types of letters (e.g., letters from co-authors, mentors, reviewers); (b) processes of solicitation of letter writers; (c) dates of submission of outside letters for departmental review; (d) expectations of outside letters; and (e) any additional questions raised in PSC conversations. a. **Rationale:** Given that different departments have different procedures and expectations for outside letters in evaluation files, a uniform process for handling letters seems in order. Additionally, the time frame of letter submission at the department level may closely align with department deliberations to warrant sufficient integration of outside letters into departmental colleague evaluations]. Sampen and Wiese both endorsed the charge.

Buescher added PSC self-charge #9 to the current draft. [Develop a policy or set of guidelines for course/faculty evaluation of team-taught courses. a. **Rationale:** Faculty approach team-teaching in different ways. For example, co-teachers can participate in the course throughout the semester, whether by teaching simultaneously or taking turns, or they can divide the semester into segments, each one led by a different instructor. In the latter case, it makes sense to administer separate course/faculty evaluations for each instructor. In the former case, though, either joint or individual evaluations could be in order. No policy or set of guidelines exist to address this issue.]

Wiese asked about the feasibility for PSC to execute all the charges. According to his communication with Chair MacBain, Buescher reported how PSC has effectively handled the tasks, some of which have already been done.

M/S/P to accept charges as amended.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 pm.

Prepared by Zaixin Hong

Submitted by Brendan Lanctot, Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Appendix:

Addendum 1

Charges for Academic Standards Committee 2014-15

1. **deferred to future meetings of Faculty Senate.**

2. **Charge:** Review the revisions made by the Offices of the Registrar and Admissions of the published materials made available to prospective students regarding the University's transfer of Running Start credit policy.

Rationale: The ASC in its year-end report asked that the Senate so charge the ASC for 2014-2015.

3. **Charge:** Consider revising University policies related to accepting transfer credits either from incoming students or from students already matriculated at Puget Sound (including transfer of credits from community college beyond the current "junior status" of 16 units or inclusion of exam scores from the Cambridge Advanced International Certificate of Education in the grouping with current AP and IB transfer credits).

Rationale: The ASC in its year-end report asked that the Senate so charge the ASC for 2014-2015.

4. **Charge:** Consider adopting a policy for medical withdrawal in study away or study abroad that involves organizations other than the University of Puget Sound.

Rationale: The ASC in its year-end report asked that the Senate so charge the ASC for 2014-2015.

5. **Charge:** Clarify and consider revising of the incomplete grade policies.

.

Rationale: The ASC in its year-end report asked that the Senate so charge the ASC for 2014-2015.

6. **Charge:** Looking back over the work of the committee during the 2014-15 academic year, indicate in your end of year report whether the size of the committee was appropriate and identify any committee work that seemed superfluous.

Rationale: The Senate is eager for each senate committee to assess size and activity.

Addendum 2

Professional Standards Committee Charges:

1. **Charge:** Review all of the PSC interpretations of the Faculty Code to see if any have become obsolete by more recent interpretations and to ensure consistency of all interpretations with the current practice and policies on campus.
 - a. **Rationale:** This was a self-charge from the 2013-14 year-end report. As a result of changing language regarding domestic partner participation in faculty evaluations the PSC discovered dated language that required updating. There are likely additional areas where language needs to be made consistent.

2. **Charge:** Create a cycle of review for department and program faculty evaluation standards and criteria.
 - a. **Rationale:** There exists no standing process by which departments and programs regularly review their standards of evaluation.

3. **Charge:** Review policy for implementation of education verification and seven-year criminal background checks for new faculty hires.
 - a. **Rationale:** PSC, in December 2013, endorsed moving ahead with these background checks. This charge follows-up on that endorsement.

4. **Charge:** Communicate with departments who use Course Assistants regarding the new interpretation to Faculty Code, Chapter 1, Part C, Section 2.a. Guidelines for Course Assistants, and review revised guidelines as needed.

- a. **Rationale:** The interpretation was affirmed by the Academic and Student Affairs Committee of the Board in February 2014. This charge follows-up on that work in order to bring departmental CA guidelines into alignment with the interpretation.
5. **Charge:** Communicate with departments regarding the new interpretation to the Faculty Code on Visiting lines and their participation in faculty evaluations.
 - a. **Rationale:** The interpretation was affirmed by the Academic and Student Affairs Committee of the Board. This charge follows-up on work in order to bring departmental procedures into compliance with the code.
6. **Charge:** Review and consider evaluation guidelines for faculty digital scholarship.
 - a. **Rationale:** As digital scholarship becomes a more common component of faculty professional growth, it is desirable for Puget Sound to implement guidelines for evaluation of such work. (see appended example) (Question: where would this document be placed? Does it end up in departmental standards?)
7. **Charge:** Review the PSC “Unified interpretation of Chapter III, Sections 4, a (1) and 4, a (c). Letters of Evaluation from Persons Outside the Department” to determine if the language on outside letters should be updated for: (a) distinctions of submission process for different types of letters (e.g., letters from co-authors, mentors, reviewers); (b) processes of solicitation of letter writers; (c) dates of submission of

outside letters for departmental review; (d) expectations of outside letters; and (e) any additional questions raised in PSC conversations.

- a. **Rationale:** Given that different departments have different procedures and expectations for outside letters in evaluation files, a uniform process for handling letters seems in order. Additionally, the time frame of letter submission at the department level may too closely align with department deliberations to warrant sufficient integration of outside letters into departmental colleague evaluations.
8. **Charge:** Clarify questions that have arisen about the faculty evaluation process as a result of the initial implementation of Moodle evaluation sites.
- a. **Rationale:** The implementation of Moodle evaluation sites has raised questions that are as much about the overall process as they are about e-files, which offers opportunity to clarify process questions for evaluatees, head officers, and evaluators, including:
 - (a) Should all administrative assistants be asked to scan Instructor and Course Evaluation Forms, rather than making photocopies? Any revision to PSC-approved protocol for administration of and management of forms?
 - (b) How are outside letters to be handled? Does the head officer, evaluatee, or administrative assistant add them to the e-file?
 - (c) Should evaluatees upload Instructor and Course Evaluation Forms?

- (d) What still needs to be provided in hard copy?
- (e) Do departments whose timelines differ from the norm (e.g., Psychology requires their files to be submitted to the department six weeks ahead of due date; Religion guidelines allow the evaluatee access to the file after it is submitted) need to come into alignment? Where is it written that files are due to the department four weeks (20 working days) prior to being due to the FAC?
- (f) Additional questions contained in the FAQ prepared by Lauren Nicandri.

9. **Charge:** Develop a policy or set of guidelines for course/faculty evaluation of team-taught courses.

- a. **Rationale:** Faculty approach team-teaching in different ways. For example, co-teachers can participate in the course throughout the semester, whether by teaching simultaneously or taking turns, or they can divide the semester into segments, each one led by a different instructor. In the latter case, it makes sense to administer separate course/faculty evaluations for each instructor. In the former case, though, either joint or individual evaluations could be in order. No policy or set of guidelines exist to address this issue.

ADDENDUM TO THE [INSERT NAME] DEPARTMENT EVALUATION STANDARDS
FOR FACULTY MEMBERS ENGAGED IN DIGITAL SCHOLARSHIP

Approved by the [insert name] Department: _____ (date)

Approved by the Professional Standards Committee: _____ (date)

Preface

The faculty member engaged in digital scholarship should satisfy each evaluation criterion – teaching effectiveness, scholarship, and service to the department, college/university, and community – at the same level of quality expected of colleagues. Due to distinctive features of digital scholarship, however, evidence of scholarship and markers of quality may distinguish the digital scholar from colleagues. Evaluation of the digital scholar offers unique opportunities and requires unique delineations because, by definition and practice, the digital scholar’s role is one that may often challenge traditional academic categories and metrics for evaluation. The existence of these distinctions, however, does not lessen the excellence of digital scholarship. The faculty member under review must provide evidence that her or his work as a digital scholar meets standards of quality prevalent among the communities of digital scholars in his or her disciplinary or interdisciplinary field.

This evaluation addendum is informed by digital scholarship evaluation guidelines endorsed by the [insert relevant professional association(s)].

Participation

Colleagues who participate in the review of a faculty member engaged in digital scholarship, whether at the department or college/university level, should be prepared to review digital work in the medium in which it was created and published. This means both that the faculty member being reviewed will be expected to provide accessible links to digital work and information on system requirements for viewing it. The review committee chair will be expected to work with the Office of the Dean to insure that appropriate technologies are available and in working order for reviewers before they evaluate the digital work.

If external peer review of scholarship is required for the evaluation or, if not required, such peer review is desired by the faculty member being evaluated, those reviewers should similarly be expected to access digital work in its medium with appropriate systems needs in place. Furthermore, if external review is required, at least [#] of the standard number of such reviewers should be peers engaged in digital scholarship.

-

Definition of work

The faculty member engaged in digital scholarship may demonstrate excellence through such traditional vehicles as publication in print journals or monographs; presentations at conventions, conferences, workshops or similar forums; publication of instructional materials; and book of materials reviews. The digital scholar may also demonstrate excellence by publishing in digital media, such as online journals and databases; conducting research or creating digital media, such as digitized collections of materials; curating online collections; or mining large cultural data sets. The faculty member engaged in digital scholarship should be expected to explain and document the work being pursued, to discuss its distinctive components and stage(s) of development, and to both articulate appropriate metrics for and evidence of the impact of the work.

Expectations

The reviewers of the digital scholar's portfolio should expect to see:

- work that is collaborative (often with colleagues who may be in staff roles in library or IT organizations);
- work that may be interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary, or trans-disciplinary;
- work that may involve experimentation and risk-taking; and
- the faculty member and peer reviewers discuss these dimensions of the work.

The reviewers of digital scholarship should avoid:

- Attempting to equate digital products with traditional print products;
- Expecting the digital scholar to do more work than other colleagues, but rather expect that quantity of work may differ even as quality of work is expected to be high;
- Dismissing digital work that includes teaching about new forms of scholarship, or service to the development of new scholarly communication organizations, as not also scholarly in its contribution to the academy.

Questions and notice

Departmental or college/university-level questions about this addendum should be resolved prior to the initiation of the review process. The addendum itself should be completed and approved as early as possible in a digital scholar's appointment, preferably by the end of the first-year and no later than two years prior to a scheduled promotion or tenure review.