

University of Puget Sound Faculty Senate

March 6, 2017 McCormick Room 4:00 pm

Present: Kris Bartanen, Nancy Bristow, Gwynne Brown, David Chiu, Sara Freeman, Bill Haltom, Alisa Kessel, Andrea Kueter, Brendan Lanctot, Pierre Ly, Siddharth Ramakrishnan, Mike Segawa

Guest: Dan Burgard

1. Kessel called the meeting to order at 4:00.

2. M/S/P to approve the minutes of February 20, 2017

3. Updates from liaisons to standing committees

Chiu: ASC has been following their charge to look at religious accommodations policy. They looked at statements from peer institutions and met with Dave Wright. They approved the statement (Appendix A) in their last meeting.

Ramakrishnan:

- IRB chair Tim Beyer reports that CITI training for students is going well. Since there is a lot of turnover on IRB, they are developing a new training document and mentoring program. This is still underway; there are some discrepancies between the document and what's on the IRB website to be resolved.
- IRB is working on how off-campus researchers can do research on campus. We might have to register with a federal agency; a lot of off-campus researchers ask us for an insurance number that we don't have.
- Beyer is appreciative of Jimmy McMichael's excellent work but thinks more administrative help may be necessary to manage the workload.

Bristow:

- PSC is continuing to discuss the senate charge to look at evaluation options for team-taught courses.
- They recently became aware that labs are not evaluated separately from the courses with which they are associated—something the PSC may want to look at in the future.

Kessel urged that this be put in PSC's end-of-year report.

Haltom: UEC was doling out money for the summer this morning.

Ly: Elections are coming up. The call for nominations will go out soon after our discussion today. The ballots will go out the 2nd week after spring break. If there are more than twice as many candidates as positions, then there'll be a primary. Elections should be done by the beginning of 2nd week of April.

Kessel reported that this week she began sending e-mails to standing committee chairs, inviting them to present their end-of-year reports at senate meetings. Senators will have read the reports

in advance, so chairs need only highlight things and answer questions for about 20 minutes. These presentations will begin in April.

4. Updates from the ASUPS President and the Staff Senate representative

Lumbantobing was not present.

Kueter:

- Staff senate meeting is coming up Wednesday. The inauguration committee, which is looking for volunteers, will present.
- Elections are coming up.
- Nominations for Excellence in Action have been slow, so please nominate someone (online).
- Committees are busy getting ready for the Staff Recognition luncheon.

5. Update from Dan Burgard, faculty representative on Development and Alumni Relations Committee of the Board

Burgard reported that this is his third year on the committee. In the past, Gayle McIntosh's report usually went out to campus and informed everybody, but we don't have that detailed report now. Some highlights:

- The Board of Trustees gave President Crawford a list of 100 presidential visit priorities. That is a lot. He's on track to see 80 or so of those 100 this year, which is impressive. He has not been asked to solicit gifts in his first year, but just to meet and chat
- There has been a drop in giving during the presidential transition, which isn't unusual although we had hoped for a bump. Donors are getting a sense of the new president.
- The trustees are amazingly generous. 38 donors gave \$500,000 or more, of whom 18 were trustees, and the top 6 were trustees or heavily influenced by trustees. The trustees aren't just "those folks over there," but highly committed to UPS.
- Alumni numbers last year, giving-wise, are as good as our peer institutions, which is often not the case. Young alum rates are the highest of any group. Because of changes to the institution over the decades, we have very different levels of engagement among different alumni generations. Now we think of ourselves as a small institution with a tight donor base, but that hasn't been the case. This year young alumni giving was down. David Beers thinks this may be because of issues such as divestment and the UPS3.
- Crowdfunding is being explored; there were 2 tries last year, centered on scholarships and experiential learning, but the results weren't great. There were 4000 new hits on the web page but only 40 of those gave, of whom only 6 were new alumni.

Bristow asked whether the effect of a major campaign ending also played a role in the decrease in donations. Burgard noted that both played a role. Bartanen added that there are major donors to the campaign who are still paying their commitments; other people who may be ready for new commitments are perhaps holding back.

Kessel reported having talked to Leslie Skinner Brown, outgoing Chair of the Alumni Council, about the role of faculty in connecting with alumni, whether that should be arranged at the

departmental level, and whether cultivating alumni engagement and investment is a worthwhile expenditure of faculty time. It's true that faculty connection is important to alumni, but it's also true that we're all exceedingly busy doing the things that are at the core of our work.

Burgard noted that the Alumni Council is only 10 years old, and so not as mature as our peer schools. We're behind the curve but catching up quickly. There is discussion of how to use summer reunion weekends more effectively, perhaps making connections with faculty and students who are still here, e.g. in the sciences doing research.

Segawa suggested that Allison Cannady-Smith and Beers and Burgard and Kessel could talk about this.

Bartanen noted that the report from board chair replaces McIntosh's report, a change requested by the Board chair in hopes that a shorter report would be more widely read.

The senate thanked Burgard.

6. Discussion of meeting times for 2017-8 Faculty Senate

After brief discussion, **Bristow moved to schedule senate meetings on Mondays 12-1:30 in 2017-18. Brown seconded. The motion passed with 2 abstentions.**

7. Discussion of revisions to PSC guidelines for eight-year review cycle

Kessel explained that the PSC's guidelines, with revisions made at the senate's request, will be brought to the full faculty meeting tomorrow. Since this affects faculty evaluation, it's important for the faculty to have a chance to weigh in. If at that meeting no one makes a motion to revise, amend, or stop the new guidelines from taking effect, then no vote will be necessary.

The revision involved this section of the guidelines: "Faculty undergoing evaluation may choose to use either the newly approved departmental evaluation standards or the most recent prior version of their department's evaluation standards, so long as the most recent prior version was in effect on the date that the faculty member's tenure-line appointment began."

Bristow expressed appreciation for the PSC's swift response to our suggested revision.

8. Discussion of revision of educational goals (see Appendix B and C)

The discussion centered on the 6th of the draft goals proposed by the ad hoc committee:

6. informed awareness of self and one's influence in the world

The key issues discussed were (1) whether the clarity and succinctness of this phrasing is optimal and should be left as is, (2) whether this would be better divided into two goals, and (3) how one might improve upon "one's influence on the world" so as to suggest that influence does not flow solely from a Puget Sound graduate to the world, but might flow the other way as well.

A lengthy, productive, detailed, heartfelt, and occasionally giddy discussion ensued. The absence of several particularly insightful members was sorely felt. Senators agreed that at a subsequent senate meeting discussion should continue over three possible wordings:

- 1) informed awareness of self and one's influence in the world (original)
- 2) an awareness of the world that informs and is informed by one's values, beliefs, and positions
- 3) an awareness of the world that informs one's values and beliefs

Kessel said that once we have a recommended wording, we should put it on the full faculty meeting agenda for discussion.

Lanctot urged that we need to think carefully about meaningful language and about what's at stake; matters of ethics are political and may generate disagreement, but this isn't a bad thing.

Freeman noted that part of the point of creating a more unified core is to have some beauty to unify around and be inspired by.

Bristow commented that "What is at stake here?" is a good question to guide our subsequent discussion on this issue.

9. Other business

Kessel reported that she and Brown have been working with Alanna Johnson and Ellen Peters from the Office of Institutional Research on the second part of data collection vis-à-vis promotion language for full professor. They are developing focus group protocol. Kessel and Brown have looked at it, and others have seen it. There will be a meeting Thursday morning to finalize the protocol. Peters and Johnson want to run a pilot focus group first before going live with three groups split according to rank (assistant, associate, full). Kessel asked for volunteers to take part in the pilot.

Regarding the Religious Observances Policy, Kessel noted that the senate doesn't need to talk about it unless someone has issues. The senate's job is to vet things, decide whether the full faculty needs to discuss something, whether it's fine and doesn't need to be discussed, whether it's fine *and* should be discussed.

10. M/S/P to adjourn at 5:14.

Minutes prepared by Gwynne Brown.

Respectfully submitted,

Pierre Ly

Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Appendix A

Religious Observances Policy Accepted by ASC 2/17/2017

The University of Puget Sound values the rich diversity of religious traditions, observances and beliefs represented in our campus community and supports the rights of students to practice their faiths. The university recognizes that in some instances a student's religious observances may conflict with the student's academic schedule. In such cases, the university endorses reasonable schedule flexibility, unless such an accommodation would create an undue burden on the student, other students, the instructor, or the college. Students shall consult with their instructor directly and in a timely manner to discuss an accommodation. The university chaplain is available to consult with students who wish to make such requests. The instructor may consult with the university chaplain or the Office of the Dean of the University for assistance as needed.

Appendix B: Educational Goals Ad Hoc Committee Meeting Notes

Appendix C: Notes on Educational Goals

Ad Hoc Committee on Educational Goals

Meeting Notes

Members: Bill Beardsley, Robin Jacobson, Alan Krause, Braid Reich, Ellen Peters, Martin Jackson

September 29, 2016

Bill, Robin, Alan, Brad, Ellen, Martin

As a follow-up to this morning's conversation, here are links to things on the university web site that might be of interest:

- Mission statement: <http://www.pugetsound.edu/about/strategic-planning/mission-statement/>
- Mission & educational goals: <http://www.pugetsound.edu/academics/academic-resources/mission-educational-goals/>
 - Note that this currently has an unofficial version of the educational goals. Now that it's on my mind again, I'll see about having this changed to the official version from the Curriculum Statement.
- Curriculum Statement: <http://www.pugetsound.edu/gateways/faculty-staff/curriculum-statement/>
- Student Affairs goals: <http://www.pugetsound.edu/student-life/dean-of-students-office/>

The AAC&U essential learning outcomes that that were mentioned are described at

<https://www.aacu.org/leap/essential-learning-outcomes>

The AAC&U has also developed a set of rubrics that provide a deeper level of detail (perhaps more than you want to see). You can get to them through links on the learning outcomes page but you have to jump through some hoops so these are attached for you convenience.

October 13, 2016

Bill, Robin, Alan, Ellen, Martin

Review of focus groups report:

- Were there others beyond the three themes identified in the summary?
 - Confidence was frequently mentioned
- Process in going from six to four categories?
 - Four categories emerged from analysis of last exercise in focus groups ("arrange in some way meaningful to the group")
- How influential was any one goal statement
 - measured perhaps by how many clusters was each in?
- What sense of discomfort with role around personal development
- high proportion cluster
- Should something like creativity be in Skills
- Shocked to see depth of student affairs interest such as role of writing, reading, critical thinking
- Personal development as a byproduct of the academic program vs. intentional part of academic program
- Responsibility of individual faculty vs. collective responsibility
- Place for something like professional prep?
- Team did not report on things that were absent such as quantitative reasoning
- Aesthetics in mission but not in ed goals

Review of mission-ed goals map:

- An approach might be to start with the items that are common to both and make sure the wording is fine, then move on to the sticky
- On active language: current wording is "curriculum will be like this" vs "students will be able to"

Review of two versions of goals:

- Is issue with wording of #7 more about "acknowledged" or about "personal values"
- What is the relation to Comparative Values?

Making a plan:

- Perhaps do easier things first, develop frame that will work
- Data suggests not much tweaking needs to be done on #2 and #6
- General scheme for more active [RJ]
- Rewrite 1 [BB]
- Keep 2 and 6 largely intact [RJ]
- Address working issues in 3
- Add core curriculum goals to mission/ed goals map [MJ]

October 20, 2016

Bill, Robin, Alan, Brad, Ellen

DISCUSSION: Language to frame the goals

Robin proposed three possible approaches to active language:

A student completing the undergraduate curriculum will have developed the capacity to:

The undergraduate curriculum develops/produces students who have the capacity to:

The undergraduate curriculum allows students to develop the capacity to:

- 1) *Communicate clearly...*
- 6) *Demonstrate a solid grounding in a special...
deeply engage in a special field...
apply a deep knowledge of a specialized field of the students choosing to...*

We discussed use of the phrases:

- To be able to
- The ability to
- The capacity to
- Develop the ability to
- Develop the capacity to
 - This language includes student responsibility
 - This language seems a bit detached
- Demonstrate

Discussion ensued about whether we are developing goals or outcomes. Outcomes would be assessment focused. There was a question about assessment of the goal or the process; the goal is being assessed via an outcome in order to inform the process. Ideally outcomes should flow from the goals. Assessment should not drive the rewriting of these goals, but it is worth keeping in mind.

There was clarification about the audience for the goals. The education goals are a guide (or inspiration) for faculty as they (as a whole) deliver the curriculum; the goals may also be used by other areas (Students Affairs) as they deliver the co-curriculum. Different faculty will emphasize different goals.

Consideration about whether the ability to do something is implicit in the activity itself (is “the ability to” necessary? Don’t you have to actually look at what they have done?) Is the ability to do it implicit in the activity itself? “Will be able to” allows for broader interpretation (will be able to think analytically allows for other kinds of thinking, whereas “think analytically” is more prescriptive.). Is the goal for them to demonstrate it, or to actually do it? Goals that guide faculty with the awareness that they will be measured leads to the “be able to” language.

DECISION: “A student completing the undergraduate curriculum will be able to...”

RATIONALE: makes the goals more active; it is simple and clear.

DISCUSSION: Educational Goal 2: “The ability to communicate clearly and effectively, both orally and in writing”

Process question: are we going to go through the goals one by one? Yes, with the proviso that we may split a goal into two goals, or combine two current goals. Start with the goals that faculty felt were most critical.

Faculty had clear agreement on the critical nature of these goals, and few concerns about wording.

DECISION: “...communicate clearly and effectively both orally and in writing.”

RATIONALE: The wording of these goals was clear to faculty, and there was wide agreement about its importance. Minor tweak to make the language active (removed “the ability to” as that sentiment is now captured in the framing language “A student completing the curriculum will be able to...”

DISCUSSION: Educational Goal 1: “The ability to think logically and analytically”

- Maybe it’s two goals because it’s a big one; internal/external?
- Reviewed the faculty phrases from the appendix of “Out of the Blue” Report.
- Includes argument and evidence.
- Maybe three parts: 1) Question a statement, 2) grasp its meaning and context, 3) understand its nuance and complexity
- Maybe ED4 (interrelationship of knowledge) can be included here?
- Critical thinking as an overriding goal and then subgoals?
- Maybe the goal is simply: A student completing the curriculum will be able to...think critically.

Meeting adjourned prior to a decision.

October 27, 2016

Bill, Alan, Martin

Review from last week

- On #1: keep simple (e.g. "critical thinking") rather than more detailed description of what might constitute critical thinking

Do all goals have to be "abilities"?

- Perhaps 1, 2, 3 are "ability"
- Then another section such as "will have gained"
- So two sets
 - Be able to
 - Will have gained

On lack of reference in current goals to aesthetics, quantitative reasoning,...

- Perhaps okay, keep at high level
- Disconnect with core goals might be okay
- Core could explicate things like "familiar with diverse fields"
- Keep ed goals general and have details in core goals/core structure
- Ed goals should be general; graduation requirements are then designed to address goals; goals should not be so specific as to unduly constrain the curriculum design

On #3:

- Ability to learn on one's own
- Current goal has two separate ideas
 - Intellectual autonomy
 - Ability to learn on one's own
- What is the relationship between working collaboratively and acting autonomously?
- "think and act independently"
- Perhaps split current goal into two separate goals and then test whether or not to keep each; if both remain, then choose between two separate goals or one combined goal
- Perhaps craft a new goal that relates collaboration and autonomy/independence
- Autonomy is dialectical
- Now have three ideas in play:
 - Capacity to learn independently of a formal educational structure
 - Intellectual autonomy
 - Collaboration; working with others
- Other clusters from discussion group report that might be relevant
 - Passion for learning
 - Open-minded, flexible, adaptive
 - Intellectual humility
 - Work with complexity and ambiguity

Plan for next meeting

- Talk through ideas for #3
- Discuss #4 and #5

November 3, 2016

Bill, Alan, Brad, Martin

On #3

- Perhaps think of
 - 1-3 as skills
 - 4-6 as knowledge, understanding
 - 7-8 as ?
 - Intellectual autonomy seems more like 7-8; is
- From other version: Ability to learn on one's own
- Is there a sense of action in autonomy?

- Is intellectual autonomy about being able to develop one's own ideas (creating knowledge/understanding)
- How does this relate to taking action on/applying knowledge
- Ability to develop and apply knowledge
- Three distinct things in relation to knowledge
 - Learn
 - Develop or produce
 - Apply
- From groups "Move from factual knowledge to figure out unknown"
- Maintain a sense of intellectual autonomy while collaborating with other autonomous thinkers
- Develop and apply knowledge independently and with others
- Learn, develop, and apply knowledge both independently and collaboratively
 - "learn knowledge" doesn't work
- Ability to collaborate while retaining intellectual autonomy
- DECISION: Develop and apply knowledge both independently and collaboratively.
- Could keep separate goal of learning on one's own

Move on to 4 and 5

- Could combine as
 - Familiarity with diverse fields of knowledge and relationships among them.
 Or
 - Will be able to understand diverse fields of knowledge and relationships among them
- "Understand" or "understand and appreciate"
- "Familiarity with diverse fields of knowledge and appreciation for relations among them"
- Awareness: Familiarity: Understanding
- Awareness: Appreciation: Respect: Recognize
- Is "perspectives" relevant/use here?

On framework:

- All "be able to" or mix of "be able to" and "will have gained"
- "understand the basics of"
- "Comfort with" in place of "familiarity"
- "Recognize existence of"
- Recognize potential perspectives/applications of diverse fields of knowledge
- Appreciate the diversity of knowledge

November 10, 2016

Bill, Robin, Alan, Ellen

DISCUSSION: Educational Goal 4. An understanding of the interrelationship of knowledge

Some possible language:

- Appreciate diverse fields of knowledge and their interrelations (from last meeting)
 - If we use this language, we need to change the framing language to "gain" rather than "ability to"
 - Perhaps if we continue to use "ability to" we need a different verb – "recognize," or "identify," or "engage"
 - Ability to draw or make connections

Discussion about the purpose of the goal:

- Is the intent that students make connections, or be aware of them?
- The connections core and upper division requirements in the core may not be enough for students to do more than be aware of connections.

DECISION: "A student completing the curriculum will be able to *draw connections between diverse fields of knowledge.*"

RATIONALE: It is a skill, and therefore calls for the "ability to" preface. The language of "draw connections" is clear and active on the part of the student. "diverse fields of knowledge" maintains the original language of "knowledge" and includes "diverse fields" in lieu of "interrelationship" in order to maintain the intent of the goal; borrows language from original goal #5.

DISCUSSION: Educational Goals 5. familiarity with diverse fields of knowledge; and 6. solid grounding in the special field of the student's choosing;

Perhaps the first four goals are "skills" for which students acquire abilities, and the next set of goals have different framing language. Both goals are supported by faculty; language is not objectionable. Substituting the word "inquiry" for the word knowledge. Does the current curriculum (core and other requirements) address the goals? Goals should drive the curriculum.

Is it important that the student choose the field? YES. Eliminate the word "special" as it does not provide any additional meaning to the goals.

DECISION: Second set of goals with have the following framing language: A student completing the curriculum will have gained/ developed...

...familiarity with diverse fields of inquiry

...solid grounding in a field of the student's choosing

DISCUSSION: Educational Goal 7. "...an acknowledged set of personal values"

- Are the goals for the faculty and curriculum, or for a broader institutional constituency? If for a broader constituency (i.e., if Student Affairs can find ways to use them) does that lead to a more collaborative approach across campus?
- Do we keep or drop?
- Faculty did not seem clear about the goal, or see it as critical.
- Does it come from comparative values courses?
- Is it about the ability to take action – translating academic work into the world? Or is it about articulating/defend values – more academic?
- Is it about personal growth? Is that a faculty goal?
- Let's skip and maybe fold into #8 (Informed appreciation of self and others as part of a broader humanity in the world environment)
- Weight in #7 is on "acknowledge" and "personal"

Another overriding consideration: Are the goals "hurdle

November 17, 2016

Bill, Alan, Brad, Martin

Confirm framing language for second section: something like "will have gained/developed"

On #5: strength of language from "understand" (strong) to "appreciate" (weak); keep "familiarity"

Keep #5 "Familiarity with diverse fields of knowledge"

- Use "inquiry" rather than "knowledge" here to be consistent with new language for #4
- Is "fields of inquiry" meaningful?
- Perhaps go back to "fields of knowledge"
- Wherever we land on knowledge vs inquiry, be consistent between #4 and #5

Keep #6 with "special" removed

On #7

- How would something like current #7 be assessed?
- Is values part of the broader institutional mission/goals?
- Can #8 be rewritten to incorporate #7 (or does it do so already)?
- Delicate issue of having students examine personal values and promoting a particular set of values
- "examined" better than "acknowledged"
- Does "appreciation" require having examined ones own values?
- Strategy: work on #8 and then come back to this

On #8

- Simple version: "Informed appreciation of self and others"
- From core curriculum goals: "to increase each students' awareness of his or her place in those broader contexts"
- "world environment" and "broader contexts" point to
- Is "others" problematic in terms of negative connotations "othering"
- "Informed appreciation of one's place/self in the world"
- #7 and 8 are about self-knowledge; 8 is more relational/contextual
- "informed awareness of one's self"
- Key elements:
 - Informed awareness
 - Place in the world
- "Informed awareness of one's place in the world"
- "informed awareness of self and one's place in the world"
- Why was "environment" added?
- Keep both "self" and "place"? Awareness of one's place requires awareness of self but seems important to list self explicitly
- "one's place" connotes "knowing your place and sticking to it"
- "position" in place of "place"? Worse? ("station")
- These wordings imply a fixed static situation
- "Informed awareness of one's potential influence on the world"
- Do we need this to go both ways? Influence of world on self
- Drop "potential"?
- "on the world" vs. "in the world": does the latter better capture bi-directionality of influence?
- Awareness of and responsibility for consequences
- "informed awareness of self and one's influence in the world"

December 1, 2016

Bill, Robin, Alan, Brad, Martin

Review a summary of where we are:

A student completing the undergraduate curriculum will be able to

1. Think critically

2. Communicate clearly and effectively, both orally and in writing
3. Develop and apply knowledge both independently and collaboratively
4. Draw connections between diverse fields of knowledge

And will have developed

5. Familiarity with diverse fields of knowledge
6. Solid grounding in the field of the student's choosing
7. An acknowledge set of personal values
8. Informed awareness of self and one's influence in the world

Note: Had not reached conclusions on #7; one idea is that #7 is implicit in #8

Discussion of this:

- #1 is very general and covers a great many academic skills such as analyze a statement in context and produce a sustained argument
- Should #5 be before #4?
 - This would be not work well with the current framing structure
 - Could incorporate "will be able to" and "will have gained/developed" into each separate goal
 - Can we combine #4 and #5?
 - Perhaps:
 - will have gained/developed familiarity with diverse fields of knowledge and be able to draw connections among them
 - will have gained/developed familiarity with diverse fields of knowledge and the ability to draw connections among them (allows us to keep in the current framework)
 - Decision: Under "will have developed", use "familiarity with diverse fields of knowledge and the ability to draw connections among/between them"
 - Check on difference between "between" and "among"
- 2016-11-10 notes indicate "gained" or "developed" rather than "acquired"
 - Decision: Use "developed" as it implies something active on the part of the student
 - Do we then need an article to lead each item?

Review last meeting's work on #8:

- Why did we keep both self-knowledge and place within world?
- Does current wording still imply one direction
- Simplified version: informed awareness of self in the world
- Do we then need to keep something like #7 to have some focus on understanding self
- Turn to report
 - High number of wording issues, lower rating (note correlation between these two variables)
 - Ideas from brainstormed goals:
- In current #7, who is doing the "acknowledging"
- Going back to discussion about "place", "influence", perhaps use "role" or "potential"
- "informed awareness of self and blah in the world"
- Add adjective to make "role" less static, more active?
- Can we make use of "interrelations"?

- Informed awareness of interrelationship between one's self and the world

Revised summary (with “personal values” goal omitted):

A student completing the undergraduate curriculum will be able to

1. Think critically
2. Communicate clearly and effectively, both orally and in writing
3. Develop and apply knowledge both independently and collaboratively

And will have developed

4. Familiarity with diverse fields of knowledge and the ability to draw connections among them
5. Solid grounding in the field of the student's choosing
6. Informed awareness of self and one's influence in the world

January 25, 2017

Robin, Alan, Brad, Martin, Ellen

Last meeting was a summary of where we are.

Revised summary (with “personal values” goal omitted):

A student completing the undergraduate curriculum will be able to

1. Think critically
2. Communicate clearly and effectively, both orally and in writing
3. Develop and apply knowledge both independently and collaboratively

And will have developed

4. Familiarity with diverse fields of knowledge and the ability to draw connections among them
5. Solid grounding in the field of the student's choosing
6. Informed awareness of self and one's influence in the world

From Focus groups

- Clarify language
 - We did that, but with critical thinking, it's pretty broad; in a report we could explain why.
- Personal values – we omitted (it is inherent in informed awareness of self...)
- Collaborative learning

Are there any ideas from the focus groups that we may have overlooked?

- Confidence
 - Focus group questions were more broad (full university experience) this may be appropriate elsewhere, and not as an educational goal.

Anything in the mission that we care about?

- Critical analysis
- Aesthetic appreciation
 - do we know what this means?
 - Should we include it?
 - Or do we point out a lack of alignment – not in the charge.
- Sound judgment
- Apt expression

When we send final report, will we include the original 8 goals?

A possible outline:

- Charge (Robin)
- Process (Robin)
- Info Sources (Brad)
 - Out of the Blue Report
 - Mission
 - Curriculum Statement
 - Include Meeting Notes?
- Data trends (Ellen)
 - Items we considered in the revision
- Current 8 goals
- Proposed 6 goals (Martin)
 - One sentence explanation of what we did.

We will write and then share via email. Next Senate meeting is on the 6th then the 20th. Robin will talk with Alisa about timing. If the 6th, any documents need to get to Alisa by next Thursday. We need to then get our writing done by the 30th.

Martin will check to see if we can post Out of the Blue on the faculty conversations SoundNet site.

Notes on educational goals

To prepare for our work to revise #6 of the educational goals, please review the following:

The revision of the goals proposed by the *ad hoc* committee:

A student completing the undergraduate curriculum will be able to

1. think critically;
2. communicate clearly and effectively, both orally and in writing;
3. develop and apply knowledge both independently and collaboratively

and will have developed

4. familiarity with diverse fields of knowledge and the ability to draw connections among them;
5. solid grounding in the field of the student's choosing; and
6. informed awareness of self and one's influence in the world

Our discussion at the February 20 Faculty Senate meeting:

"Discussion:

Several members of the senate expressed concern over wording of new item #6, "[a student will have developed] informed awareness of self and one's influence in the world," and whether "influence" sufficiently communicates the bi-directionality of this goal. Some points of concern included:

- Jacobson reported that the subcommittee's discussions and recommendations did not stray from faculty conversations.
- During faculty-data gathering, it was argued that awareness means more than personal values, culminating in "informed awareness" phrasing of new Item #6.
- One suggestion was to modify current wording to say, "informed awareness of self and others"
- The insertion of "values and beliefs" was suggested to specify what was meant by "awareness."
- Kessel proposed that the senate accepts the subcommittee's report but continues discussion on possibly rewording item #6 in the next senate meeting, to which the senate members agreed."

The meeting notes of the ad hoc committee dated November 10 and 17 (notes attached).

Questions and considerations from the Board of Trustees workshop (from Alisa's notes)

Content questions:

- why remove 'values'?
- does the 'bi-directionality' come through, especially with respect to how students influence the world?
- are their particular values—such as intellectual honesty or respect for a diversity of options/respect for other points of view—that are part of the classroom experience that could be identified here?
- should we engage the 'value proposition' of a liberal arts education and articulate our own values?
- why isn't there a bigger difference between the original and the revision, especially in light of educational changes since the originals were crafted (e.g. collaborative and active learning, new ways of talking about the liberal arts)
- measurability?
- relation to employability of graduates?

Structural questions:

- what is accomplished by educational goals and what is accomplished by other means (such as the mission statement as a value proposition)?
- what changes are we contemplating on campus if we approve this revision?
- what is the relation between the educational goals and the core requirements? How is the curriculum revised (if at all) in light of these changes?

SOME OPTIONS:

Option 1: Disentangle educational goal # 6 into two parts

Rationale: There are too many things to capture in a single item while also trying to maintain simple and straightforward language.

Some possible language:

Part I: Informed awareness of one's values and beliefs and those of others.

Part II: Informed awareness of one's position in and influence on the world.

Option 2: Leave as revised

Rationale: The faculty objection or discomfort around the language of personal values may have been resolved by the committee's recommendation to disentangle 'skills acquired' from 'attributes in development' in the new configuration of educational goals. That is, faculty might reasonably object to being expected to teach students *how* to acquire a set of personal values; faculty might be more satisfied to note that students are expected to develop a set of personal values by virtue of their education at Puget Sound.

Option 3: Revise the language of educational goal # 6 (in a single part)

Rationale: try to capture the bi-directionality of the "influence" consider where 'values' fit, if at all.

Some possible language:

Informed awareness of the interaction between one's values and the values of others.