

Faculty Senate
McCormick Room, Collins Library
Minutes of the April 6, 2015 meeting

Present:

Pierre Ly, Ariela Tubert, Jonathan Stockdale, Andrea Kueter, Kris Bartanen, Bill Haltom, William Beardsley, Emelie Peine, Paige Maney, Chris Spalding, Maria Sampen, Leslie Saucedo, Derek Buescher, Zaixin Hong

Guests:

Martin Jackson, Julie Nelson Christoph

1. Chair Tubert called the meeting to order at 4:03 pm

2. Announcements

Secretary Ly reported that 126 of the 249 faculty members (51%) had accessed the ballot for the final round of the Senate election as of Monday morning (April 6). 148 faculty members voted in the Faculty Elections Primary held a week earlier. The 2015 Faculty Elections will close at 1:30 pm on April 8.

Tubert announced that the “Wednesday @4” session on April 15 will discuss “Classroom Behavior: Bridging Faculty and Student Expectations” (Panelists Ben Lewin, Molly Pugh, and Ariela Tubert, moderated by Tiffany MacBain).

3. M/S/P Approval of the minutes of March 9, 2015

4. Updates from liaisons to standing committees

Haltom reported that an ASC policy subcommittee joined the CC in discussing the CC’s proposed language for revised instructions to the staff in the Registrar’s office with respect to students who transferred into Puget Sound from quarter system schools. The draft reads:

To implement the option of fulfilling the Foreign Language Graduation Requirement by the successful completion of two semesters of a foreign language at the 101-102 college level, the Registrar’s Office may substitute a single transferred first or second quarter of a 100 college level foreign language course for the 101 level semester provided the student successfully completes a semester of that foreign language at the 102 college level.

Buescher reported that the PSC recommended changes to the current practice for submitting minutes. Standing committees will no longer need to submit signed hard copies. Instead, they will submit electronically signed minutes to Jimmy McMichael via email

(jmcmichael@pugetsound.edu), and Jimmy prints the minutes and archives them. (Note: an electronic signature is, for example, the standard "Respectfully submitted, Jane Doe.")

Buescher distributed the PSC Recommended Revisions to Interpretations of the Faculty Code (Appendix A) prior to the meeting. He read the three substantive revisions that PSC chair MacBain highlighted on 1) Page 47, lines 31-34; 2) Page 48, line 10; and 3) Page 48, lines 29-30. Haltom mentioned that "Per page 7 of the Faculty Code, the PSC must share this document with the Faculty Senate and the Academic and Student Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees." Bartanen noted that the document is about the review of the interpretations of the Code as MacBain's email indicates: "The Senate is to include the document in its minutes, and 'any member or members of the university community who are aggrieved by an interpretation of the faculty code by the Professional Standards Committee may appeal that interpretation to the Faculty Senate....in writing, within ten (10) working days following publication of the interpretation in the Senate minutes.'"

Hong reported that in recent LMIS meetings, the Technology Service team provided updates on the Maximize Project, and Library Director Carlin talked about "Envisioning the Library of the Future."

5. Updates from the ASUPS representative and the Staff Senate representative

Maney reported that the new ASUPS President Nakisha Renée Jones inaugurates today and will hire her cabinet members tomorrow.

Maney announced that Reina Gossett, a trans youth activist, will be speaking in the Tahoma Room at 7:30 pm on April 7th, and the Take Back the Night rally will be in the Wyatt Atrium at 8:30 pm on April 8th, in support of Sexual Assault Awareness Month.

Senators gave Maney a round of applause in thanking her for the service.

Kueter reported that several Staff Senators have recently left the institution so there are many open seats on the Staff Senate to be filled during this year's elections, which are currently in process. The Staff Senate meets next on Tuesday, April 14th, and the meeting will focus on the Staff Senate's response to the new Annual Performance Review process, and the proposed new merit system.

6. Discussion of the Curriculum Impact Statement approved by the Curriculum Committee

Stockdale distributed the Curriculum Impact Statement (CIS, Appendix B) prior to the meeting. Following the Senate charge to develop the Statement, the CC has developed and approved it for today's discussion.

Buescher raised the question of what would happen if people disagreed with new proposed majors, minors, interdisciplinary programs, emphases, and other courses of study, on the basis that they are considered too similar to existing ones. Beardsley explained that the purpose of the

CIS is purely to gather information. Up until now, there hasn't been this kind of communication. Stockdale restated the Senate's rationale for the charge, which is "to allow a channel of feedback from impacted programs to both the curriculum committee and program proposers." Tubert seconded Beardsley that the CIS is for an information assessment.

Bartanen mentioned that when professors come up for tenure review, for example, the Department and FAC must indicate that their position is needed at the university. Sampen said the CIS will be a bridge in this regard.

Buescher asked again how an affected program could object to a newly proposed program within the confines of the CIS – it seems like people are forced by the CIS to approve whatever is proposed. Peine wondered whether the chair's letter could be optional, since this could add up to a lot of chairs' letters and a lot of extra work. Stockdale wondered if only chairs in "primarily" affected programs might be asked to write letters.

Stockdale said he would contact the Curriculum Committee to ask for revisions to the CIS as suggested by Buescher and Peine.

7. Report from the ad hoc committee on the Connections Core

Prior to the meeting Stockdale distributed the Report of the Senate ad hoc working group reviewing the Connections Core (Appendix C). He recounted the history of working group activities reviewing the Connections Core. The working group examined the Connections rubric, the 2013 Curriculum Committee review of the Connections Core, and Institutional Research findings regarding students' experiences in Connections. The working group recommends no major overhaul of the rubric, and instead created opportunities in Summer 2014 for faculty to enhance their Connections teaching through collaborative faculty workshops. The committee also noted some challenges of teaching Connections, including teaching "the interrelationship of fields of knowledge" when faculty may teach at the margins of their expertise, and the high enrollment limits of 44 for team-teaching a Connections Core.

Jackson mentioned the success of the Teagle workshop "Enhancing Connections" last summer. Stockdale explained that it provided a collaborative opportunity for faculty teaching a Connections course to have their syllabi reviewed and assessed by a colleague on campus teaching in a related area of expertise.

Saucedo asked whether there could be restrictions in certain departments to prohibit students from taking a Connections Core in their own department, in order to avoid the imbalance sometimes encountered in Connections where some students know the materials at a high level and others are relative newcomers. Beardsley said that it is the advisor's role, and that it is the point of Connections to bring students together around varying fields of expertise.

Buescher addressed concerns primarily about professors' use of the resources and about their self-selection process.

The Senate accepted the ad hoc committee report.

8. Discussion of the possibility of creating advisory boards for First Year Seminars, KNOW requirement, and Connections Core

With Christoph as a co-proposer, Associate Dean Jackson offered the rationale for a discussion of the possibility of creating advisory boards for First Year Seminars, KNOW requirement, and Connections Core. He explained that the main motivation is to address existing gaps in the “care and feeding” of certain parts of the shared curriculum with a secondary motivation being to provide ideas for rethinking shared governance. Broadly speaking, the proposed advisory board would be in charge of five aspects: 1) Offer faculty development and support for the three areas; 2) Recruit faculty to develop and teach courses in these areas; 3) Advocate for resources; 4) Play the role of department in five-year reviews done by the Curriculum Committee; and 5) Review new courses for approval (possibly in place of the Curriculum Committee although this would require changes to the Bylaws).

In facilitating the discussion, Director Christoph introduced the strengths and challenges the Center for Writing, Learning, & Teaching faces in supporting faculty who teach in these three areas. She suggested that it would be beneficial to have a broader base of faculty responsible for leading faculty development opportunities, and suggested that some portion of the next capital campaign might go toward supporting faculty development opportunities related to teaching in graduation requirements that involve teaching beyond disciplinary expertise.

Haltom suggested that discussions of “shared governance” should consider three problems: 1) The Problem of Self-Selection -- volunteers for advisory committees will tend to agree with each other from the start and to the exclusion of alternatives; 2) The Problem of Creating a Lobby -- forming an advisory committee to garner resources and swag risks promoting self-serving and insider-serving measures; and 3) The Problem of Groupthink -- self-selection plus sharing payoffs leads the advisory body to become ever less representative of the faculty. Bartanen noted that according to the Bylaws an advisory board has no power to approve a course.

Jackson reconsidered that the proposal would now be that an advisory committee might provide feedback to a course proposer before a proposal is sent to the CC for review. Both Stockdale and Buescher requested written materials for more information should the discussion continue. Tubert seconded the request.

9. Discussion of the faculty governance orientation for first year faculty members

Saucedo reported on her meetings with Associate Dean Kukreja in regard to first year faculty members' priorities on governance/service. Saucedo invited Senators to join an informal session

that she and Tubert will host in the Murray Boardroom lounge at 1-2 pm on April 16, to introduce to first year faculty members university structure and the roles of different committees, and to answer questions before they sign up for positions for next fall.

10. Discussion of a request from the Accessibility Working Group that students with accessibility needs be granted extended time for filling out student evaluations

Tubert noted that the request is a matter of the PSC, so it should be referred to the committee for feedback perhaps as a charge for next year

11. Meeting adjourned at 5:31pm.

Minutes prepared by Zaixin Hong.

Respectfully submitted,

Pierre Ly, Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Attachments:

Appendix A: Recommended Revisions to Interpretations of the Faculty Code

Professional Standards Committee 2014-15

Appendix B: Curricular Impact Statement

Appendix C: Report of the Senate ad hoc working group reviewing the Connections Core

Recommended Revisions to Interpretations of the Faculty Code
Professional Standards Committee 2014-15

Members: Kris Bartanen, Geoffrey Block, Douglas Cannon, Betsy Kirkpatrick, Tiffany MacBain (Chair), Andreas Madlung, Mark Reinitz, Amy Spivey

In the 2014-15 academic year, the Faculty Senate charged the Professional Standards Committee to “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.” The PSC has completed the review and revised the interpretations as indicated below.

The PSC determines these revisions to be significant and so submits them in accordance with the instructions in the Faculty Code, Chapter I, Part G, Section 1: “If the Professional Standards Committee deems an interpretation to be of significant merit it shall issue a formal written interpretation which shall be delivered to the Faculty Senate for inclusion within the Senate minutes. Such interpretations shall also be forwarded to the Academic and Student Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees for its concurrence.”

Not included below, but in need of revision to align with existing policies, is the Interpretation of Chapter VI (Grievances arising from allegations of sexual harassment). Dean of Diversity and Inclusion Michael Benitez will recommend changes to this Interpretation following the university’s Title IX review in the summer of 2015.

APPENDIX

Page 39, line 8: Because the Appendix contains current interpretations and interpretations that are no longer active, change “This Appendix contains current interpretations” to read “This appendix contains such interpretations.”

Page 39, lines 23-48: Given that technology has evolved to the point where it is easy to search PDFs, and given the potentially incomplete nature over time of the list of references to “working days” in these lines of the Code, the PSC recommends that lines 23-48 be deleted from the Appendix.

Page 40, lines 8-14: Because these lines are outdated and do not align with the language of the “Campus Policy Prohibiting Harassment & Sexual Misconduct” document, delete lines 8-14. Add to the end of this Interpretation (of Chapter I, Part C, Section 2, and Chapter I, Part D, Section 4) the line: “This policy aligns with the university’s conflict of interest provisions in the Code of Conduct as well as Section II, Part E (“Consensual Sexual Relationship”) of the Campus Policy Prohibiting Harassment & Sexual Misconduct.”

Page 41, throughout entire Interpretation of Chapter I, Part C, Section 2, and Chapter I, Part D, Section 4: To bring the language of the Code into compliance with Title IX, as recommended by Dean for Diversity and Inclusion Michael Benitez, replace “spouse” with “partner,” and replace “children” and “child” with “dependent children.”

Page 41, lines 42-49: Committee members expressed concern about ambiguity in the text regarding the timing of PSC reviews of departmental guidelines for the use of course assistants. Change the sentences beginning with “Thus” in line 42 to read, “Thus each department employing course assistants should submit to the Professional Standards Committee a document that explains the duties, responsibilities, and supervision of course assistants. The PSC will review departmental statements for agreement with the guidelines. Upon obtaining committee approval, the department may then employ course assistants in accordance with the departmental document and need not submit that document again for PSC review until the guidelines in the Code or the departmental document are revised.”

Page 42, line 9: To bring the language of the Code into compliance with Title IX, as recommended by Dean for Diversity and Inclusion Michael Benitez, use the gender-neutral pronoun “their” instead of “his/her” in the phrase, “in their courses.”

Page 43, line 15: To correct a problem with sentence structure, the PSC recommends changing the first sentence of line 15 to read, “The evaluation process is clearly career-influencing.”

Page 43, lines 38-39: To correct a typographical error sending readers to an incorrect section of the Code, and to align with the recommended language for page 45, line 5 (below), the PSC recommends changing the lines to read: “If you have concerns regarding obligations under this policy, please refer to Chapter 1, Part D, Section 4 of the *Faculty Code* (‘Professional Ethics’) and/or speak with your head of department, school, or program or the Academic Vice President.” The font size and type should be the same as the surrounding document.

Page 45, line 5: “department head” becomes “head of department, school, or program.” Change sentence to read: “The faculty member must request that there be a delay in consideration for tenure or promotion by writing to the head of department, school, or program and the Academic Vice President, normally no later than one semester before the scheduled evaluation.”

Page 46, Interpretation of Chapter III, section 4. To bring the language of the Code into compliance with Title IX, as recommended by Dean for Diversity and Inclusion Michael Benitez, replace “spouse” and “mate” with “partner.”

Page 47, lines 31-34: To correct outdated language (“photocopied”) and to affirm the writers’ ownership of their letters of evaluation, the PSC recommends that the lines read: “In the case of an open file, the faculty member being evaluated has access to letters in the evaluation file and may take notes while reviewing the file. If the faculty member desires copies of the letters, the faculty member must seek copies from the writers.”

Page 48, line 10: To clarify how outside letters should be solicited for faculty evaluations, add the following statement after the phrase “if they seem relevant”: “In consultation with the evaluatee, the head officer may also solicit appropriate letters from outside the

department or university. When soliciting the letters the head officer will notify the letter writers of the status of the file as open or closed.”

Page 48, line 17: For consistency’s sake, change “confidential letters” to “a closed file.”

Page 48, line 18: For clarity’s sake, change “those individuals who submitted letters and a summary...” to “those individuals who submitted letters to the head officer and a summary...”

Page 48, line 19: To correct an error of reference, change “Faculty Code: Chapter III, Section 4, b (2) (a) and Section 4, b (2) (b)” to “Faculty Code: Chapter III, Section 4, b (2) (a) and Section 4, b (2) (e).”

Page 48, lines 29-30: Because the university affirms the validity of electronic signatures, change bracketed note to read: “As defined for purposes of interpretation, a letter of evaluation is a signed document.”

Curricular Impact Statement

Rationale

During academic years 2013-2014 and 2014-2015, the Faculty Senate charged the Curriculum Committee to “[d]evelop a curricular impact statement and process of formal communication for new program proposals (e.g., to Chairs and Directors) prior to program approval.” The Senate’s stated rationale for the charge was “to allow a channel of feedback from impacted programs to both the curriculum committee and program proposers.” In response, the Curriculum Committee requests that proposers of new majors, minors, interdisciplinary programs, emphases, and other courses of study complete a Curricular Impact Statement (CIS). Proposals will be considered incomplete until the statement is submitted.

Purpose

Proposals for new majors, minors, emphases, interdisciplinary programs, or other courses of study must include a CIS in order to:

1. demonstrate the limitations of the current curricular structure and explain how those limitations warrant a new course of study;
2. ensure and document that principal stakeholders are aware of the implications of the new course of study for existing programs; and,
3. explain which additional resources may be required in order to deliver the new course of study effectively.

A Curricular Impact Statement must include each of the following:

1. A statement of rationale that explains why students are unable to meet the learning objectives of the new course of study given the university's existing offerings of majors, minors, emphases, interdisciplinary programs, or other courses of study.
2. A statement identifying:
 - a. which departments, programs, or schools may be affected by the proposed course of study; and,
 - b. how these departments, programs, or schools may be affected by the proposed course of study. This discussion might include, but is not limited to: (1) any courses that will be cross-listed; (2) any existing courses that will be required, recommended, or potentially used to satisfy the requirements of the new program; and (3) any existing departments, programs, and schools that may see a significant increase or reduction in course enrollments due to the new course of study.
 - c. which departments, programs, or schools have been notified in writing of the proposal for the new course of study.
3. Letters from all directors or chairs of the departments, programs, or schools identified in part 2 of the CIS that state either:
 - a. the new course of study being proposed can be supported with the existing resources of the department, program, or school; or,
 - b. the new course of study being proposed cannot be supported with the existing resources of the department, program, or school, but the department, program, or school will be able to support the new course of study by making specifically identified adjustments in course offerings or resources by the time that the new course of study is offered.
4. A statement identifying what additional resources may be required in order to deliver the new course of study effectively.

Motion approved by CC 4 March 2015

Motion drafted by Working Group 4 (Feb 2015)

[Beezer, Carlin, Ferrari, Johnson, & Rogers]

Based on Draft (Feb 2014) [Anderson-Connolly, Beardsley, & Johnson]

Report of the Senate ad hoc working group reviewing the Connections Core

Timeline of activities:

Spring 2013	Curriculum Committee's final report calls for Senate working group to assess the Connections Core more completely
Fall 2013	Senate creates ad hoc working group; working group begins reviewing the Connections Core
Summer 2014	Working group creates and leads "Enhancing Connections," a collaborative workshop funded by the Teagle Foundation designed to enhance teaching in the Connections Core
Spring 2015	Working group leads "Wednesday at 4" session to share results from the Connections Core review; issues final report to the Senate.

Summary of Working Group Activities

When the Curriculum Committee conducted its regular (every fifth year) review of the Connections Core in 2012-13, the review turned up a wide spectrum of positive and negative perspectives on this particular Core among faculty, ranging from "it's the best mutual learning experience I've had at UPS" to "it's broken and can't be fixed." Because an in-depth re-assessment of the Connections Core was beyond the capacity of the Curriculum Committee working group conducting the review at that time, the Curriculum Committee recommended in its year end report that the Senate form a working group to re-assess whether the Connections Core was working smoothly or was "broken" and in need of fixing.

The subsequent fall, the Senate charged a Senate ad hoc working group to conduct a review of the Connections Core. The working group—consisting of Hans Ostrom and Jill Nealey-Moore (frequent teachers in the Connections Core) and Jonathan Stockdale (of the Faculty Senate)—met regularly throughout the 2013-2014 school year. Over the course of the year, the working group examined the Connections Core rubric, the 2013 report of the Curriculum Committee working group on the Connections Core, and the 2012 Core Curriculum Assessment generated by the Office of Institutional Research.

Given widespread positive assessments of the Connections Core experience from both students and faculty, the working group concluded that the Connections Core rubric itself was not in need of revision. However, given recurring questions raised about the Connections Core during previous reviews, the working group concluded that more efforts were needed on campus to support and promote effective teaching in the Connections Core.

To that end, the working group coordinated with Associate Dean Martin Jackson to create and lead “Enhancing Connections,” a collaborative summer 2014 workshop (funded by the Teagle Foundation’s Engaging Evidence grant) to enhance teaching in the Connections Core. As a result, 12 professors met in two mini-workshops over the summer: 6 professors teaching in the Connections Core and 6 professors who collaborated with them to assess their syllabi and to suggest enhancements based on their disciplinary expertise. By facilitating faculty collaboration across disciplines, the workshop thus sought to offset a singular challenge of teaching in the Connections Core: the challenge of teaching “the interrelationship of fields of knowledge” when some of the fields taught may be at the edges of a professor’s area of expertise.

Building on the success of the “Enhancing Connections” workshop and the productive discussions among participants that emerged from that workshop, the working group facilitated a “Wednesday @ 4” session in Spring 2015 to relay its findings, and issued this final report back to the Senate.

Summary of Findings

While there are dissenting voices out there, the working group noted a general sense of satisfaction with the Connections Core both among faculty and students. Some faculty teaching in the Connections Core offered comments like “the Connections courses are among the most rewarding and enjoyable that I have been involved in,” or “it is the best mutual learning experience I have had at UPS.” A glance at courses listed in the Connections Core reveal a distinctive and diverse array of offerings, with examples ranging from “The Harlem Renaissance” or “Asia in Motion” to “Education and the Changing Workforce” and “Geological and Environmental Catastrophes,” to name only a few. Regarding students, a 2012 Core Curriculum Assessment conducted by the Office of Institutional Research found that students reported their Connections courses “enhanced their ability to analyze a subject from multiple approaches” – whether “strongly” (65%) or “very much, quite a bit, or some” (89.4%). As one student commented, “we’ve been trained to be students for such a long time, we start off really broad, and then we go into specific majors, and I think what Connections is trying to do is put you in the real world, intellectual stage, having lots of different people from different disciplines . . . at the same time, it starts discussion between different disciplines; professional students talking to professional students.” Some faculty listed the opportunity to facilitate sophisticated discussions between students of diverse majors—just when those students are poised to move on from the university—as one of the most rewarding features of the Connections Core.

At the same time, the working group noted that teaching in the Connections Core presents some singular challenges, particular to this core. These cluster around three areas:

1. Professionally, the Connections Core can be challenging to teach precisely because the Core seeks to develop “understanding of the interrelationship of fields of

knowledge by exploring connections and contrasts between various disciplines.” Such courses can be especially challenging to teach when the “fields of knowledge explored” may be at the edges of a professor’s original area of expertise.

2. Pedagogically, the Connections Core can be challenging to teach because students from vastly different disciplines are brought together to explore “interdisciplinary issues at a level of sophistication expected of an upper division course.” As a result, upper level students who may be in the same major as the professor teaching the course might find themselves together with students taking their first course in that area of study. As one philosophy professor noted, students whose first encounter with philosophy comes in a philosophy connections course “cannot be called sophisticated philosophers – although they may come out knowing more than anyone else on campus about the particular area explored in that course.”
3. Structurally, the Connections Core in the past has been seen by some as a natural fit for team teaching, through which professors can literally embody “participating in cross-disciplinary dialogue.” However, a recurring critique of the Connections Core is that team-taught Connections courses have their enrollment limits set at 44, which for many professors creates a major disincentive to teach in this Core. As the working group heard many times over, the experience of teaching such high numbers is more akin to each professor teaching 44, rather than each professor somehow compartmentalizing the teaching of 22 students.

Working Group Recommendations

1. Related to challenge #1 above regarding teaching Connections, the working group recommends that more support be provided for those developing or seeking to enhance Connections courses. The working group strongly endorses the model for faculty collaboration across disciplines modeled by the “Enhancing Connections” workshop (perhaps supported by funding from Burlington Northern curriculum development grants), whereby a faculty developing a Connections course could be paired with another faculty in an overlapping area of expertise who could provide collaborative assessment, feedback, and support.
2. Related to challenge #2 above, bringing together students of varying academic backgrounds presents a fine line for professors to negotiate in their Connections courses, and some professors appear to do this particularly well. The working group recommends that in addition to posting this report on the Connections Core, some sample syllabi of successful Connections courses be posted as well, perhaps on a future Curriculum Committee webpage.
3. Related directly to the issue of enrollment limits set at 44 for those team-teaching in the Connections Core, the working group feels that a more ideal arrangement would be a 34 student limit – commensurate with the size of two first-year seminar

classes combined. However, given current budgetary constraints, it appears unlikely that this change should be expected any time soon.

Respectfully submitted,

Jill Nealey-Moore, Hans Ostrom, and Jonathan Stockdale

April 5, 2015