

University of Puget Sound Faculty Senate  
April 30, 2018, 12pm  
Library 020

Present : Kris Bartanen, Gwynne Brown, Anna Coy (staff senate), Kena Fox-Dobbs, Robin Jacobson, Kristin Johnson, Alisa Kessel, Jung Kim, Sunil Kukreka, Pierre Ly, Tiffany MacBain, Andrew Monaco, Collin Noble, Siddharth Ramakrishnan, Sarah Walling-Bell, Peter Wimberger

Guests: Derek Buescher, Sue Hannaford, Jill Nealy-Moore, Seth Weinberger, Liz Collins, George Tomlin

1. Call to order 12:02
2. Approval of the minutes of April 16, 2018  
M/S/P
3. No Updates from the ASUPS representative.
4. No updates from liaisons to standing committees.
5. Receipt of year-end reports

*Faculty Advancement Committee report*

Nealy-Moore highlighted that the report was written in order of importance and reviewed numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, and 8 from the report. The FAC is seeking permission to package and distribute this to the full faculty.

Kessel will ask PSC to include the chart which delineates teaching time in the buff document when she passes on the FAC report.

Kim asked about comments on closed versus open files in the report. Nealy Moore suggested open files may prevent a more honest and full critique in the third year that would better prepare faculty for tenure review. Weinberger suggested that junior faculty could be put in a bad position with open files.

Wimberger asked if the FAC talked about a creep of accelerating timeline to full. Nealy Moore said the data did not inspire that conversation this year rather than a discussion of people going up at the third year review which was more common this year.

M/S/P to receive the report

## *University Enrichment Committee*

Buescher noted that there was complete turnover on the committee which was quite challenging and requested the executive committee to ensure some consistency when assigning to the UEC in the future. He reviewed three self-charges in the report.

Kessel asked who would pilot the food per diem program and what percentage of awards would be part of the pilot for the upcoming year. Buescher said it will be a random sample of faculty.

Kena suggested the faculty information session could be done at a Wed at 4 and Pierre said he noted that. Buescher suggested there might be other venues as well to hit a broader audience.

M/S/P to receive the report

(Note: for receipt of the LMIS report, see item 8 below)

### 6. Consideration of motion regarding ad hoc committee to address bias in student evaluations of teaching

Kessel led a discussion on membership, charge, and timeline of an ad hoc committee.

Conversation on the membership issue focused on soliciting former members from each of the following committees: PSC, COD, FAC, and at large faculty, as well as a representative from the Dean's office and a student representative. A number of faculty stressed the importance of the PSC input for efficiency since they have thought deeply about it. Other concerns were about overall size of the committee in terms of work process and impact on service assignments across the university. Faculty committee members could range in size from four members to six members. Kessel invited those with other thoughts to email her.

Conversation on the charge focused on its breadth and how directive the senate wanted the charge to be. Faculty noted there were two big issues with student evaluations, bias and inaccuracies in assessment of teaching effectiveness. Coy suggested that the form is but one piece of the process and that we consider the larger system including how student evaluation is solicited and the forms are presented. Ideas on avoiding being overly directive included a charge focusing on values and previously identified alternatives, staggered or two part charge, and a mid semester report. Bartanen stressed that student evaluations could not just be done away with and that there was no knowledge of how these studies critiquing the accuracy of evaluations connected with our specific system. The educational opportunities present in engaging faculty and students on the question of bias was noted.

Kim, Ramakrishnan, and Fox-Dobbs will help construct language on this with Kessel.

Bartanen said there was the possibility of hiring a consultant.

7. Updates from the ASUPS representative and the Staff Senate representative  
Staff senate update: still preparing for staff recognition event May 18. Staff retirees are included this year. President Crawford will be there and speak a bit, greet staff members. Thanks to all the faculty volunteering to serve on that day. Elections are complete and new officers will be named May 16.

8. Receipt of year-end report form Library, Media, and Information Services Committee

Sue Hannaford presented the report. LMIS worked very hard on the charge they received last year. A finalized user-friendly document will come soon to help faculty handle sensitive data, something they are often not familiar with. Hannaford noted the need to also have IRB, PSC and the FAC look at it to help with the kind of data they handle as part of their work. Given the hard work LMIS has put into this, they don't want to see the document get lost. They don't want it back either, as this is not the best use of LMIS time.

Besides the charge, LMIS worked on things as they came up. Hannaford's own opinion (not on behalf of LMIS as a whole) is that it would be useful to have a conversation about how issues get prioritized and where faculty input is most needed. For example, faculty are not usually part of the planning process with projects like the transition Moodle to Canvas, or from Cascade to Peoplesoft. Recently, when new changes were announced to the campus, SH received a lot of emails asking if LMIS had been consulted, but they weren't.

Kim asked how vital faculty participation is in such projects. Hannaford said there were practical limits. Faculty tend to operate on a longer time scale, which fits well with the library planning schedule. But Technology Services has a faster schedule, and it would be impractical for faculty to be part of the planning for things like transitioning from Moodle to Canvas. But still, faculty input is often useful since tech services staff come from very different professional backgrounds.

Kessel expressed appreciation for the effort the committee in putting together the document regarding sensitive data for faculty.

M/S/P to receive the LMIS report.

9. CLOSED SESSION: Consideration of nominees for the Walter Lowrie Service Award

10. Meeting adjourned at 1:20pm

Minutes prepared by Robin Jacobson and Pierre Ly.

Respectfully submitted,  
Pierre Ly  
Secretary of the Faculty Senate

April 27, 2018

TO: Faculty Senate

FR: Jill Nealey-Moore, Chair of the Faculty Advancement Committee, on behalf of Jill Nealey-Moore, Steven Neshyba, Dawn Padula, George Tomlin, Seth Weinberger, and Sunil Kukreja

RE: 2017-2018 Annual Report

The Faculty Advancement Committee (FAC) this year will have completed 41 evaluations (with an additional five Head-Officer-Only reviews, as allowed under the Faculty Code, completed by the Dean of the Faculty):

Type of Review	Number and Status of Evaluations	Used Moodle Site
Tenure	4 (2 open, 2 closed)	4
Tenure and promotion to Associate	2 (1 open, 1 closed)	2
Promotion to Associate/Clinical Associate	6 (4 open, 2 closed)	6
Promotion to Professor	8 (7 open, 1 closed)	8
Three-year Assistant	5 (4 open, 1 closed)	5
Three-year Associate/Clinical Associate	5 (5 Head-Officer-Only)	NA
Five-year Professor	12 (12 streamlined)	10
Three-year Instructor	3 (1 open, 1 closed, 1 streamlined)	2
Ongoing Visiting Assistant	1 (closed)	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>38 (92% of eligible)</b>

The FAC has forwarded evaluations for tenure, tenure and promotion, and promotion to Associate Professor or Professor to the President. Some of these cases were considered by the Board of Trustees at the October 2017 and February 2018 meetings; some will be considered at the May 2018 meeting.

The FAC met for a total of 30 hours from October through December 2017 and will have met 52 hours for the Spring 2018 semester. FAC members estimate that they spend roughly 15 hours per week reading files and preparing evaluation letters in addition to time spent in meetings. As described in previous annual reports, we welcome a discussion as to whether the 1 unit release per year is sufficient for this level of service, while emphasizing that the work itself is vital, educational, and inherently inspiring.

### Key Observations and Recommendations

1. Improving the Pattern of Class Visits: Patterns of class visitation for evaluatees vary widely by individual and by department. The Faculty Code sets two visits by two colleagues as the minimum standard, yet it should be evident that a greater number of visits, spread across semesters and courses, is desirable. This is true both in evaluations that are formative (where there is no change in status but where providing feedback to the evaluatee is crucial) and those that are summative (e.g., assessment for the purposes of tenure and promotion). We continue to see too many clusters of visits to the same few class sessions in the early Fall semester for tenure files, and we see too many visits occurring in the Fall semester for other files. Every Head Officer receives a chart of candidates for tenure two years ahead (and, for all

other reviews, one year ahead) in order to facilitate an ongoing pattern of class visits. It is especially important for pre-tenure faculty to have ample opportunity to gain colleague feedback prior to the tenure review.

Information provided by visits is most helpful when visits are spread evenly across classes and courses, and take place in the semesters in which student evaluations are also collected. Doing so means that evaluatees have the benefit of earlier feedback (when they are better able to incorporate it into teaching or use it as the basis of reflection in their personal statement). If issues are identified through student evaluations in a course, then there are also faculty observations of that same course offering, providing an additional perspective. We also note that greater numbers of faculty visits may also be useful as a strategy to counteract potential bias in teaching evaluations.

In light of our concerns, the FAC requests that the Senate discuss this issue, and consider asking the PSC to alter requirements for class visitations.

2. Addressing Bias in Student Evaluations: Members of the FAC appreciate the work done by members of the PSC to make faculty aware of potential bias in evaluations on the basis of gender and ethnicity. The FAC is already sensitive to this concern, and we have been discussing the potential for bias in evaluations in our deliberation of files. In the absence of an official policy, we will continue to do so, but we would like to request further guidance on this issue from the PSC, the Faculty Senate, and the faculty.

Since we do not know precisely to what extent this widespread phenomenon applies to students at Puget Sound, several precautionary steps seem immediately advisable. First, when department colleagues review the student evaluations of evaluatees, awareness could be maintained of explicit “gendered” student critiques of an instructor as well as implicit and systematic biases on a gender or racial basis, and colleagues could make appropriate adjustments to their overall appraisal of teaching effectiveness. Second, future FAC members could keep this potential (even likely) bias in mind when they review the student evaluations in a file. We note that we are not attempting to set university policy by offering these suggestions, and these suggestions should not be taken as a full remedy of the problem.

3. Mentorship of Junior Colleagues: The FAC would like to encourage colleagues to provide increased mentorship of junior colleagues preparing materials for their files, as well as to encourage junior colleagues to seek out such guidance. An evaluatee who is putting together a file for the first time may not be aware of important resources that are available, including consulting closely the *Faculty Evaluation Procedures & Criteria (Evaluation “User Guide”)* document and seeking out examples of personal statements from more senior colleagues. We especially encourage department chairs to reach out and provide guidance to junior faculty in their department.

4. Delineation of Teaching Load and Release Time: The FAC is tasked with judging the strengths of evaluatees who work in different departments and who often have differing academic roles and even teaching workloads due to release units, sabbaticals, and other university contractual duties. Clear delineation in the file of release time and teaching load during the period of review, by the evaluatee, the Head Officer, or both, preferably in *chart form* would help ensure more accurate interpretation of the file. In addition, where the number of student evaluations is small, a description of reassigned time and what was accomplished would be informative in the FAC’s overall equitable consideration of the file. We

would like to encourage this chart to become a standard part of every file submitted, in the same way that Head Officers are asked to include a chart documenting classroom visits.

5. Career Path and Time Span Delineation: The FAC would also like to encourage evaluatees to accurately reflect on their curriculum vitae their career paths with respect to academic rank, i.e., “Assistant Professor [year] to [year],” “Associate Professor [year] to [year],” “Tenure granted [year],” etc. The FAC carefully makes an appraisal of the amount of professional growth in evidence over the span of the corresponding period of evaluation. It would also be helpful for the evaluatee to indicate in their statement the period of time encompassed by the review, to help ensure that departmental colleagues are assessing the correct time span. It would also be helpful for Head Officers to include this information in their letter.

6. Preparing for Promotion at the Third Year: The FAC encourages assistant professors to consider carefully whether they wish to go up for promotion in the third year if they are eligible. If they choose to do so, they should have early conversations with the Head Officer to ensure that their first and second year reviews (and the Head Officer letters from those reviews – especially the second year letter) provide them with the type of information and guidance that prepares them to apply for promotion in their third year.

7. Guidance on Evaluating Non-Standard Positions: If a colleague has a type of position that differs from our typical categories (i.e., Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor, Visiting Assistant, Instructor, Visiting Assistant Professor or clinical versions of professor categories) or the terms of their employment are unique, members of the department should be clear on how they are evaluating the file with respect to departmental guidelines. Further, members of the department and the Head Officer should communicate this information to the FAC in their letters, since the FAC may not be aware of the expectations for these positions. This is particularly true if the expectations for the position are not clearly described in departmental guidelines. Departments may want to consider altering their guidelines to reflect non-standard positions.

8. Use of Classroom Observations: The FAC encourages departments to have conversations about the practice and use of teaching observations in their department. We note that observations are typically performed in a summative fashion, and as a community of teachers who are dedicated to improving our art, formative use of evaluation is being under-utilized. This is true of colleagues at all levels. Observations of classroom teaching can be undertaken in a highly-supportive, collaborative manner, and this is especially true if it is done at the invitation or request of the teaching faculty member. Junior members of a department are also likely to benefit from being able to observe classroom teaching of more senior colleagues, and this opportunity is diminished with the more recent shift to streamlined and Head-Officer-Only files. As mentioned above, increased classroom observations by faculty may be an important remedy in counteracting bias in student evaluations. As a connected issue, departments may want to have a conversation about the use of open and closed files and how that might shape the type and depth of feedback that is provided to colleagues, especially by junior (more vulnerable) colleagues.

### **General Comments**

The following sections contain general and audience-specific suggestions that are important for the clarity and success of the evaluation process, and ultimately, the success of the candidates. In some

cases, these suggestions are repeated from prior FAC reports, but they are either still in need of fuller attention or are so important they bear reiteration. The remainder of the suggestions arose out of issues identified in AY 2017–2018.

### *Evaluation Standards*

The FAC is pleased that the Faculty Senate and the faculty at large have begun to engage in a discussion about revising the criteria for promotion. We are particularly eager to have clarified or addressed the role of service, especially if the present criteria of “excellence” remains important in the attainment of the rank of Professor. We note that having distinct and clear guidelines for promotion to different ranks would reduce ambiguity for departments and the FAC, reducing variation in how the Code is interpreted.

In previous years, the FAC has encouraged the Faculty Senate to open a discussion in the faculty to reassess university-wide expectations in light of changes in the university’s profile since 1999, of new forms of scholarship and creative work, and of new venues for publication in the digital age. The Committee continues to be hopeful that this discussion will provide the basis for the PSC to then rewrite the “university standards” section (not revised since 1999) of its *Faculty Evaluation Procedures & Criteria* document.

### *Promotion*

For the past two years, we have offered a significant call for the faculty to articulate expectations around promotion to Professor: Is every candidate truly ready for promotion to Professor, the highest rank of the faculty, at the first point of eligibility to stand for promotion? We have received some feedback that some faculty members perceive that they must stand for promotion to Professor at the first opportunity that they are eligible; we wish to reiterate that no one is required to stand for promotion to Professor. As described in the Code, faculty members may elect to remain at the “Associate 7” step on the Faculty Salary Scale and receive “across the board” increases to the salary scale. The Dean’s Office communicates each summer with faculty eligible for promotion in the next review year regarding their choice to have a promotion review or a regular three-year review.

### Advice to Colleagues:

The FAC observes that the lack of student evaluations in lab classes remains problematic, particularly hindering the ability to gauge teaching in files where laboratory instruction is a significant portion of an evaluatee’s teaching load. The FAC has previously suggested that the Professional Standards Committee invite faculty input on this topic, and encourages departments to be involved in this process to ensure that suitable forms for their laboratory-based classes are approved, should this formal step be taken.

In evaluating the scholarly work of an evaluatee, the FAC reminds colleagues that it is useful to comment in evaluation letters on the quality of the products, their contribution to the field, and the scope of the audience (regional, national, international).

### Advice to Head Officers:

The FAC reminds Head Officers that the deliberative letter – informed by individual colleague letters and deliberative discussion – should address “the needs of the department, school, or program and the

university” as a criterion for tenure reviews (see Faculty Code, Chapter III, Section 3.d). The Code explicitly calls for “demonstrated need” for the position.

In change of status reviews, the Head Officer summary of deliberation letter (along with the FAC and President’s letter) are forwarded to Trustee members of the Academic and Student Affairs Committee of the Board and need to reflect the formative and summative substance of the departmental discussion.

We recommend that Head Officers be identified a year in advance of the evaluation, particularly when department chairs, directors, or deans are up for review; the Head Officer needs to ensure that there is an adequate set of class visits. The Dean’s Office provides the information about who is up for review one year in advance (and two years in advance for tenure evaluations).

The Advancement Committee expects that, in accordance with the Faculty Code, Chapter III, Section 4.d.(1), “No later than four months after receiving the report from the Faculty Advancement Committee, or notification of action by the Board of Trustees in cases of tenure and promotion, the head officer meets with the evaluatee to discuss the results of the evaluation.” Such discussion not only allows for the clarification of individual teaching, scholarly, and service expectations moving forward, but also promotes acknowledgement of FAC feedback that may be of larger departmental concern. The FAC encourages fulfillment of this portion of the code, as it is an important part of the evaluation process.

The Committee appreciates that many Head Officers have this year provided a chart of class visits at the beginning of deliberative summary letters (who visited which classes and when) in order to document clearly all class visits conducted by colleagues; we encourage this practice by all Head Officers as we would otherwise struggle to discern accurately the ongoing pattern of class visits.

In the preparation of Head-Officer-Only letters written for Three-year Associate Professor reviews, the FAC would like to encourage Head Officers to offer evaluative guidance with respect to departmental (as expressed in departmental guidelines) or university (as expressed by the Professional Standards Committee and the Faculty Code) expectations, as the candidate prepares for their next review period. Given there is no C.V. or evaluation statement required for the HOO file, and having observed the care with which the FAC reviewed evidence of sustained professional growth in promotion files, the Dean recommends greater attention by Head Officers to the purpose of the Three-year Associate review in preparation for the future promotion review.

#### Advice to Evaluatees:

The FAC again encourages evaluatees, in accordance with the Faculty Code and *Faculty Evaluation Procedures & Criteria* document (p. 18), to include a list of professional objectives, both short-term and long-term, in the personal statement. We also encourage evaluatees to include information about their teaching philosophy and how it relates to what they do in their courses, given the centrality of pedagogy-driven methods in our broader mission.

The FAC affirms the usefulness of evaluatees including in their file copies of scholarly materials (publications, conference papers, proposals, letters from editors, etc.) that evaluatees are citing as evidence of professional growth. The Committee encourages evaluatees to describe progress made on scholarly or creative projects since the time of the previous review, in addition to discussing the content of that work. Such an approach allows the Committee to more readily ascertain “sustained growth.” The Committee observes across a number of files calls from evaluators for evaluatees to make clear their



roles in co-authored or collaborative work. Department, school, or program Head Officers can also assist the FAC in understanding how “author order” for collaborative work is to be interpreted in the specific field. Departments could also add such information to departmental guidelines during their next cycle of review by the PSC.

FAC members have the prior Advancement Committee’s evaluation letter available to them and treat it as important context for their review of the current file. We encourage evaluatees to review this letter and to include a discussion of it in their personal statement, particularly how they may have addressed any concerns that were raised.

Evaluatees undergoing Three-year Associate Professor reviews are allowed but not required to submit materials for their file, given that these are Head-Officer-Only reviews. The Advancement Committee notes that an unintended consequence of this process is that without additional information provided (CV, statement, scholarly material or teaching evaluations) it is difficult to consider the Three-year Associates as candidates for teaching or research awards. Thus, the FAC would like to encourage evaluatees to include these materials if they would like to be considered for awards. The FAC invites the faculty to consider an amendment to the Faculty Code to incorporate the possibility of a Three-year Associate Professor choosing a Head-Officer-Only, a streamline, or a regular review.

### *Conclusion*

The FAC has concerns that the important ideas contained in this report will not receive as wide an audience as is optimal, despite it being made available to faculty through web-based mechanisms. We have particular concerns that some of the individuals who would most benefit from access, chiefly, junior colleagues, may not know of its existence or how to access it. Indeed, even more seasoned colleagues who are serving as first-time Head Officers may not know of the importance of reviewing this report and related documents when they assist evaluatees in preparing their files. Accordingly, we seek permission from the Faculty Senate to send out a user-friendly form of the information contained in this report directly to the faculty through email or through dissemination to department chairs, with the intention that it would be given directly to the faculty. The intention is to allow us to send a “love letter,” named as such to better gain faculty attention, but also to convey that it is intended to help the evaluation process be less stressful for evaluatees and department members who are evaluating them. The committee will take acceptance of the content of this annual report by the Faculty Senate as permission to disseminate such a document, although we are open to feedback about how the Senate would prefer for this to happen.

All existing members of the Advancement Committee will be returning to serve again during the 2018-2019 year. We want to thank Dean Sunil Kukreja for his guidance and capable direction this year as he stood in for Provost Kris Bartanen on the FAC. We also wish to thank Provost Bartanen for her continued consultation. We appreciate the opportunity to serve our colleagues and the university in this capacity.



University Enrichment Committee  
End of Year Report 2017-2018

Membership:

Faculty: Luc Boisvert, Derek Buescher (Chair), Erin Colbert-White, Andrew Rex, Tanya Stambuck, Barbara Warren, Bianca Wolf

Students: Simone Mayarri Moore, Briana Williams

Ex Officio: Renée Houston (Associate Dean)

Senate Liaison: Lynda Livingston (Fall), Andrew Monaco (Spring)

The UEC has successfully completed, or will have completed by the end of the spring 2018 semester, all of the regular yearly duties assigned, including evaluating and awarding student research proposals in the fall (November) and spring (April), evaluating and awarding faculty research proposals in the fall (December) and spring (March), hosting the Register Lecture (March), evaluating and awarding Release Time Awards for faculty (February), determining the recipient of the Dirk Andrew Phibbs Award (May), and the evaluation of nominations for the purpose of selecting the 2019 Register Lecturer (May).

SENATE CHARGES: The UEC has the following standing charges set forth in The Faculty Bylaws:

The duties of the Committee shall be:

1. To promote the professional growth of the Faculty by seeking and receiving funds for research and travel, to budget and allocate such funds, and to receive and approve research and travel reports.
2. To seek and allocate funds for student research.
3. To seek nominations and select the Register lecturer.
4. To support Faculty leaves such as sabbaticals, grant-assisted leaves, and exchanges.
5. Such other duties as may be assigned to it.

The Faculty Senate provided the UEC with one additional charge when they charged the committee with:

- revising the faculty travel award allocation process to enhance flexibility of award allocation and simplicity of reporting for faculty.

Given the financial implications of this charge, ex officio member Associate Dean Renée Houston formed a subcommittee with the Office of Finance and Associate Dean Sunil Kukreja to explore options for enhanced flexibility for travel award allocation. At its April 27, 2018 meeting

the UEC endorsed a proposed pilot study for 2018-2019 faculty award travel allocation. The subcommittee explored a variety of options for enhancing flexibility in travel award allocation including increasing the overall cap for the award but given the potential costs and financial ambiguity of an across the board cap increase, settled on the pilot program of a per diem rate for food at \$50.00/day. During fall semester 2018, a few faculty receiving an award and traveling to different locations will be given an option to receive the \$50.00 per diem. The per diem will not require processing meal receipts, but will be subject to fit within the overall award cap. If this process is deemed more efficient and shows an overall financial impact consistent with the current faculty award budget, it may be extended to all faculty travel awards. The UEC maintains a long-term goal to ease the cap on conference travel after the impact of the pilot program is determined.

#### ADDITIONAL UEC DISCUSSIONS:

In addition to the standing and senate charges, the committee discussed a number of business and procedural matters deriving a suggested change to the Regester nomination timelines as well as three proposed charges for the 2018-2019 committee.

#### Regester

The committee proposes moving up the timeline for Regester nominations, submission of materials, and decision process. The current process has nominees submit materials in late April with the committee meeting simultaneously for student summer research awards while handling end of term issues. We recognize that many committees are finalizing important matters at the end of term and propose still the following timeline:

- Solicit nominations in the fall with a due date of the first Friday of February;
- make nominee materials due the first Friday after spring break; and
- finalize a decision by mid-April.

We hope that this timeline functions to increase nominations by allowing nominees time over spring break to assemble materials while also giving the committee adequate time for review.

#### Proposed Charges for 2018-2019 Committee

The committee proposes the following charges for the 2018-2019 committee:

1. Evaluate the process for professional school student research award submissions including consideration of holding information sessions for all interested students to clarify the evaluation process.
2. Review committee documents to ensure consistency between evaluation rubrics and submission guidelines.
3. Consider establishing a fall information session for faculty openly reviewing the professional development opportunities available and the procedures and expectations for application.

### Conclusion

The work of the University Enrichment Committee this year was extremely collegial, focused, efficient, and productive. I am grateful for the diligence, and patience, of my student and faculty colleagues as we worked through our responsibilities. I especially wish to thank Lisa Hutchison for her professionalism, clarity, and thoroughness in assisting the UEC.

One note for the Faculty Senate (especially the incoming Chair and Vice Chair): the staffing of committees is an unsolvable puzzle, but this year's Enrichment Committee was comprised of members with little to know institutional memory. The committee had only one returning member from the prior year, and that individual had served only the prior Spring semester. The ex officio role also was a new Associate Dean. As a result, we, notably I as chair, fumbled some through timelines and details of the committee. We encourage, as challenging as it is, to avoid complete or near complete turnover of the committee on an annual basis in order.

Respectfully submitted,

Derek Buescher, UEC Chair, 2017-2018  
Professor of Communication Studies and Director of Forensics

Hi all,

This is far from finished, but I thought I'd share a draft document that we can discuss on Monday. I'm assuming that we'll finally discuss (and maybe pass) a motion on 5/7, but I wanted to get your thoughts before then. I have spoken with Sara Freeman, and we think that the composition of the ad hoc committee needs to be settled during this academic year so that next year's executive committee can populate it as they do the rest of the service assignments. Hence, a bit of haste. We can talk more on Monday.

Thanks, all!

I'll send you the UEC report when I get it . . .

Alisa

INTERIM MEASURES beyond the ad hoc committee:

- Charge the PSC to consider additional support measures
- Reach out to the mentoring work group to consider how to support faculty who are adversely affected by bias in SET
- Consider training or something along those lines for the FAC members
- Consider training for departments (at chairs' meeting or in another way)

Ad hoc committee

In light of substantial evidence demonstrating the unreliability of student evaluations of teaching (SET) in measuring teaching effectiveness and the considerable reliability of student evaluations of teaching in reflecting student biases, the faculty unanimously endorsed a measure at its April 25, 2018, faculty meeting requiring the Faculty Senate to create an ad hoc committee for the purposes of

- 1) mitigating the problem of bias in student evaluations, and
- 2) recommending a long term solution or change to our current system.

In discussion of the motion, the faculty identified the following concerns:

- that the experience of engaging evaluation bias is traumatic for many colleagues and that these colleagues (particularly junior colleagues) may need mentoring and support
- that any response should be undertaken with due diligence and with haste, given the urgency of this problem and the ongoing adverse effect on many faculty
- that the question about efficacy of SET itself should be considered as part of the committee's charge
- that the fact of bias exists outside of SET and that an educational

The Faculty Senate proposes an ad hoc committee with the following membership:

- 1 former member of the PSC
- 2 former members of the FAC
- 2 former members of the COD
- 2 ad hoc member of the faculty
- one student representative

- one representative from the Dean's office

The Faculty Senate charges the committee with the following tasks:

- to identify an approach to inviting student participation in course evaluation that minimizes bias

OR

- to consider the role of student participation in the review, tenure, and promotion processes and to make recommendations to the faculty about revisions to the process

OR

- to develop a revision to the evaluation process that addresses the problem of bias in SET and the inefficacy of SET in assessing teaching effectiveness

Timeline:

- Report back to Faculty Senate in December 2018
- Report to the faculty in spring 2019

---

Alisa Kessel, PhD  
Professor & Chair  
Department of Politics & Government  
University of Puget Sound  
1500 Warner Street  
CMB 1052  
Tacoma, WA 98416-1052  
Phone: 253.879.2929  
Office: Wyatt Hall 216

To: Faculty Senate

From: LMIS: Susannah Hannaford (Chairperson), David Latimer, Wade Hands, William Kupinse, Lisa Wood, Jane Carlin, Kate Cohn Jeremy Cucco, and Ann Geason,

Concerning: Report LMIS Charges 2017-2018

Date: April 26, 2018

Dear Colleagues:

The following is a summary of our responses to the Faculty Senate Charges. For further information, we encourage you also to consult the LMIS minutes posted on SoundNet. Below we review our work on each of the charges from the Faculty Senate. Rather than following the convention of discussing each of the standing charges laid out in the Faculty Bylaws, we (1) begin with the additional charge from the Senate, since this work has dominated the committee's work this year. (2) Next, we report our progress on the standing charges. (3) Finally, the committee looks ahead to some issues next year's committee might explore.

I. This year the Faculty Senate charged the LMIS Committee *"to work with Institutional Research and Technology Services to identify which of the existing data use policies concerning the appropriate use of institutional data on campus are most relevant to faculty, and develop and distribute informational resources to help faculty understand and comply with these policies."*

LMIS is forwarding the Faculty Senate a draft document entitled "Best Practices for Managing Sensitive Documents" (attached). The committee has devoted the majority of its meetings to drafting this document. To this end, committee members have brainstormed about the sorts of sensitive documents we encounter in our professional capacities, we have reviewed policies of other universities, and we have consulted with in-house experts (i.e., Jeremy Cucco, Kate Cohn, Michael Judd, Ann Gleason) to gain insight into legal and practical issues of data management. In brief, members of the LMIS committee recognize that faculty are sometimes inattentive to how we manage sensitive data, but we also conclude that faculty would be willing (and would want to) implement practices to avoid exposing information that might cause our students and colleagues embarrassment. The committee appreciates that university staff is working to minimize such exposure; for example, Technology Services has been systematically encrypting university-issued faculty computers, so that if they are lost or stolen, no one will be able to access sensitive information. The committee also recognizes, however, that faculty inevitably are privileged to (and retain) sensitive information in their professional capacity. We have embraced the Senate's charge to "develop a resource to faculty understand and comply with these policies."

The Faculty Senate's charge extends further, suggesting that LMIS *distribute* this resource. The committee respectfully suggests that, prior to distributing our working document, the Faculty Senate refer the draft to other entities for review. In particular, we think it would be useful to have the Professional Standards Committee review the recommendations for Faculty and Staff Documents and to have the Institutional Review Board review the recommendations for HIPAA protected Documents. We also recommend that the Senate consider referring the document to CHWS, CWLT, Data Standards, the Student Accommodations Office, Registrar, and HR for feedback. The LMIS committee recognizes that following such review, it may be appropriate to return the document to next year's LMIS for further review and to address some unresolved issues. For example, this year's LMIS committee members are not confident that we have adequately considered issues of creative products with multiple authors, such as recordings of live music and theatre performances, podcasts, written work and other products. Finally, LMIS recognizes that the finalized "Best Practices" document will continue to evolve and we suggest that LMIS be prompted to review this document periodically to make sure that it remains current.



The LMIS committee has spent some time thinking about how best to distribute the completed document. We offer the Senate several suggestions, including:

- An open forum in Wednesday at Four or other settings to solicit faculty feedback,
- Distributing the document to all faculty, perhaps through faculty.coms or via the department chairs meeting,
- Including the document in new faculty orientation,
- Directing the Faculty Advancement, Professional Standards, and Academic Standards Committees (as well as any other adjudicating committees) to consider how they currently handle confidential and sensitive documents and to provide feedback about our guidelines. They may want to develop committee guidelines that would be shared with new members about retention and disposal,
- Linking the document to the university's website, so that faculty will find and be able to use this document on line, and
- Asking Technology Services to offer working sessions to assist faculty in organizing and purging sensitive documents from their computers.

Given the effort that has gone into drafting this working document, this year's LMIS committee sincerely hopes that the document will, in time, be distributed to all faculty campus-wide. Having said that, the committee also would like to move on to other issues. We feel that we have given the Senate's charge our best effort and that the university will be best served if next year's LMIS is able to focus on other business.

II. The standing charges laid out in the Faculty Bylaws are:

- *To develop general policies, procedures and plans in collaboration with the Library Director and the Chief Technology Officer.*
- *To provide recommendations and advice to all parts of the University community on the role of the library, media and information systems in support of the academic program.*
- *To review periodically the mission and objectives of the library and information systems and to recommend such changes as are needed.*
- *To review periodically the collection development plan for the library to ensure that a balanced collection is maintained for effective support of the academic program.*

During the 2017-2018 academic year LMIS acted on these charges as follows.

On 9/22/2017 the committee met in the Maker Space in the library. At this session, librarian Jada Pelger and student employee Max Assael, provided a tour of the space to the committee. Library director Jane Carlin briefed the committee on the promise of the space as well as the challenges associated with staffing and funding the facility. On 12/1/2017 Lindsay Morris and Annie Cain (of Technology Services) presented the new myPugetSound pages, to illustrate the improved mobile experience and other updates. In December the committee also reviewed the library's self-study of trends associated with library use as well as budget and space concerns. On 3/20/2018 LMIS discussed the growing cost of interlibrary loan. Also on 3/20/2018 LMIS discussed the library's policy on challenged library materials. This discussion led to a broader conversation about the value of archival material, including material which today is recognized as objectionable (e.g., racist, sexist material). The committee visited the library archives on 5/1/2018 to see how the Collins Library staff preserves archival materials. On 5/1/2018 the committee discussed how the upcoming library and Technology Services reorganization would impact faculty and students.

### III. Looking ahead

As described above, this year's LMIS has focused on drafting guidelines for handling sensitive data. The committee affirms that the collaboration between faculty, associate dean's office, technology services, and the library has been key to producing a working document that we think faculty will find useful. We are proud of our effort and of the product. But there has been a tradeoff. Notably, while faculty has been kept *informed* of changes initiated by the library and media and information services, the faculty have not had an active role in planning for such changes. Thus, we recommend that next year's LMIS committee return to its normal agenda. In particular, we would like to see the committee facilitate a broad discussion of "the role of the library, media and information systems in support of the academic program" and to "review periodically the mission and objectives of the library and information systems and to recommend such changes as are needed." [Language taken from standing charges to the LMIS committee.] We note an increasing move to integrate technology and information systems in the library space. This integration provides new opportunities but also involves losses, both of which will be felt by faculty and students. These changes merit further exploration, and LMIS seems like an appropriate venue for such conversation.

## **BEST PRACTICES FOR MANAGING SENSITIVE DOCUMENTS – DRAFT**

### **INTRODUCTION**

This document is intended to provide guidance in the management of confidential and potentially sensitive documents that faculty may retain either as electronic documents or hard copies. At a bare minimum, faculty, like all university members, must comply with federal law as outlined in the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA); a summary of the university policies and procedures designed to protect the privacy of student education records can be found at the following link:

<https://www.pugetsound.edu/academics/advising-registrar/know-educational-rights/>. However, faculty typically retain sensitive documents such as student emails, CVs, grade spreadsheets, graded work, recommendation letters, and related documents which are not legally part of the student's official education record but nonetheless contain sensitive information about the student that could be embarrassing or cause harm if made public. Additionally, faculty often retain both confidential and sensitive documents which do not fall under the purview of FERPA but nonetheless contain sensitive information that should remain confidential. Such documents could include evaluation letters of colleagues (including off-campus personnel), research or clinical materials, and service related documents from committees on and off campus.

### **CONTEXT**

Questions about how long to retain these documents, where to store them, and whether or not retaining documentation that is linked to an individual puts the university at risk (e.g., a student transcript or disability disclosure) continue to arise. At the request of the Faculty Senate, the LMIS Committee addressed this topic over the 2017-2018 year. As we reviewed existing documentation, current protocol and legal requirements, we recognized that document retention is a complex issue. This document seeks to provide recommendations and guidance for faculty in a practical manner. We found the Student Affairs Policy for Document and Data Retention and Destruction from the University of California, Santa Barbara, very useful in compiling our recommendations and acknowledge its use with permission.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

We recommend that each faculty member be aware of the location of all sensitive documents in their possession, both in electronic and hard-copy form, and develop a plan to organize, store, and annually eliminate these documents. Electronic documents are most secure on a faculty member's home directory:

<stafffiles.pugetsound.edu/username>. University-issued personal computers are relatively secure, if password protected and encrypted. Personal computers and electronic devices are generally less secure, and sensitive documents should not be stored on these devices. There is no need to retain official university

correspondence such as a student transcript or grades. If sensitive documents are required as working documents, follow the guidelines listed below in Electronic Records. If you need copies for letters of recommendation or review, these can be supplied by the student and should be deleted once consulted. Below we provide guidelines specific to electronic and hard-copy formats.

We end this document with some suggested guidelines regarding the destruction of less-sensitive documents. The cost associated with the long-term electronic storage of documents is non-trivial, and we encourage faculty and departments to develop practices that are recognize this fact.

## **ELECTRONIC RECORDS**

Faculty should follow the procedures below when considering electronic records. Technology Services can provide guidance and assistance; send requests and questions to the Technology Service Desk ([servicedesk@pugetsound.edu](mailto:servicedesk@pugetsound.edu)).

1. Email: Emails containing sensitive information should be marked as such. For example, use confidential in the subject line of emails and for documents, use the watermark feature to identify as a confidential document. Delete appropriate messages from folders and then empty the Deleted Items folder in Outlook. Legally, information transmitted by email is not considered confidential.
  - (a) In terms of communication with students, we should treat emails as if they were protected under the FERPA statutes. Note that even prospective students are protected by FERPA.
  - (b) Email should not be archived on your Home Directory.
2. SoundNet: SoundNet (<https://soundnet.pugetsound.edu>) is recommended as a repository for confidential documents that might be associated with search committees. Technology Services can assist in setting up access to SoundNet for Committees, Teams, and Departments.
3. Network File Shares: Files on network file shares that are past their retention periods should be deleted from the file server. Once files are deleted from network file shares, they will be purged from the system and not included in future backups. The university keeps deleted files locally for 8 weeks, remotely for an additional 8 weeks, and in cold storage for up to one year per our Data Retention Policy (<https://www.pugetsound.edu/about/offices-services/technology-services/policies/backup-and-data-retention/>).
4. Home Directories : University data that is stored in home directories is subject to the same retention and elimination policies and files past their retention periods should be deleted in the same manner as those on other network file shares.

5. Local Hard Drives: University data should not be kept on users' local hard drives. If university data exists on these drives, it should be moved to the appropriate location on a network file share or deleted.
6. University Data: Contact Technology Services for assistance in eliminating all records that are past retention. Staff may be able to help set up automated mechanisms for review and/or elimination of records when retention periods are reached.
7. Acceptable Incidental Personal Use: Personal files stored locally on a university computer as part of acceptable incidental personal use of campus electronic resources should be stored on a short-term basis. Long-term storage should be on a personally owned flash drive. Files stored on university owned equipment may be subject to search in the case of legal action and may also be accessible to other people using the computer. Personal non-university related files (e.g. photos, videos, music, etc.) should never be stored on the Home Directory, as the university incurs the cost of backing up these files.

## **HARD COPY RECORDS**

When hard copy records and documents are to be destroyed, faculty should follow the procedures below:

1. All files with confidential information must be shredded, either manually in the office or through the university's contracted document destruction service: <https://www.pugetsound.edu/about/offices-services/office-of-finance/procurement/furniture-shredding-toner/#shredding>,
2. Confidential documents and records requiring shredding may not be taken off campus for personal destruction (e.g., an employee owns a paper shredder and offers to shred the documents at home—this is not allowed).
3. Non-confidential documents or records may be destroyed through disposal in departmental or University-controlled recycling bins.

## **GUIDELINES FOR LESS SENSITIVE INFORMATION**

Some records are not sensitive in nature, but still should be given consideration from time to time to make sure that academic departments are most efficiently using resources. The following are discussion points that each department could consider, perhaps on an annual basis:

- How are members of the department doing collaborative work? Do they utilize the share/network drive? Does each department have a network drive (if not, Technology Services can assist). Or, are they using SoundNet? Programs like Dropbox and Google Drive should be discouraged, especially in cases where projects are distinctly tied to the university, for reasons of licensing and data protection. If

- Documents and files that take up a significant file size should be evaluated. Departments could host a “clean-up day” where an audit guides work to minimize and remove unneeded files. For example, if pictures have been taken at a university event, do they all need to be saved? Or, if someone utilized a revision process, which resulted in several Word documents, all with similar content, with various revision dates on each of the files. Do they all need to be saved, or perhaps only the final product?

DRAFT

**Recommended Document Storage Guidelines LMIS Working Draft 6 May 1, 2018**

Type of Document: Legally Protected	Level of Protection	Recommended Storage Options	Retention & Purge Recommendations	Resources for Further Info Web Links
<p align="center"><b>FERPA Protected</b></p> <p><b>Examples:</b>  <b>Student records</b> (official and unofficial)                      All admission application documents including: formal and informal information linked to individual students, financial information, interview data. All personal contact information of students and their families. <u>Student grades and grade sheets.</u>  <u>All materials collected as part of student disciplinary actions, complaints, or hearing boards.</u></p> <p><b>Health, academic, or personal data</b> from CHWS, Office of Student Accommodations, Dean of Students, Residence Halls, e.g. communications about student status, progress, disposition of hearing boards, petitions, conduct boards, other adjudications, communications about academic accommodations, illnesses, or leaves of absence</p>	<p><b>Highly Confidential</b>                      Not shared without signed informed consent, and release. Release includes specified time frame, and purpose. Must conform to FERPA guidelines.</p> <p><b>Retention and review of permissions and releases should be addressed at an administrative level and in departments and committees</b></p>	<p><b>Do Store In:</b> Digital documents should be stored on <u>University Share Drive</u>, or encrypted disk drive or encrypted computer drive. Drives not in use should be stored in locked secure cabinets. Use locked file cabinet for paper records.</p> <p><b>Do Not Store In:</b> Email files, non-encrypted computer, external drive or internet-based storage, cloud storage, cell phone. Do not store on personal computer or laptop.</p>	<p><b>Minimum Recommended Retention is 3-5 years unless likely usage clearly extends longer.</b>                      Materials that can be accessed easily in the future should be purged when there is no indication of future use.                      Purge methods: shredding of hard copies via locked commercial containers, full erasure of digital including email, cloud, external and computer drives.</p>	<p><b>Note:</b> Student Healthcare documents collected on campus are covered by FERPA, unless collected by OT/PT clinics or as part of research program that falls under HIPAA guidelines (per grant or professional licensing of those conducting the research).</p> <p>When in doubt, faculty, students, and staff should follow HIPAA <b>and</b> FERPA guidelines, until protocol is clarified.</p> <p>Community research samples are not covered by FERPA. Data from non-students should be handled in accordance with HIPAA.</p>
<p align="center"><b>HIPAA Protected Docs</b></p> <p><b>Examples:</b> All health data collected by the university for staff, faculty or the community should be handled in accordance with HIPAA guidelines, <u>regardless of whether or not the data is technically HIPAA protected.</u> This includes physical health, mental health, and</p>	<p><b>Highly Confidential</b>                      See above guidelines on release. <b>Must follow HIPAA Protocols for Processing and Storing Data</b></p>	<p><b>Do Process and Store HIPAA docs:</b> on encrypted drives, or within a 3<sup>rd</sup> party, HIPAA-certified solution (such as those now in use by the University, i.e. MyClientsPlus, WebPT, Jituzu, and Point-N-Click).</p>	<p><b>Follow HIPAA guidelines for retention of Healthcare Data</b></p>	<p>Professor Ann Wilson is the campus contact for HIPAA regulations.</p>

<p>also education or work-related accommodation info.), All health research data on non-students collected (or stored on campus) by faculty, students or staff <u>should be handled in accordance with HIPAA guidelines</u></p> <p><b>Note:</b> The schools of OT and PT are the only programs required to follow HIPAA guidelines on campus (They are HIPAA Entities).</p>		<p><b>Do Not Store or Process HIPAA docs:</b> No HIPAA documentation should ever be stored on the university shared drives. Do not process on non-encrypted drives or personal computers</p>		
<p><b><u>IRB Protected Documents</u></b> <b>Examples:</b> All student and faculty research data governed by IRB protocols, including participant information collected during recruitment or participant selection procedures.</p>	<p><b>Highly Confidential</b> See above guidelines on release. <b>Must follow IRB Protocols</b></p>	<p>See “<b>DO Store In</b>” guideline above</p> <p>See “<b>DO NOT Store In</b>” guideline above.</p>	<p><b>Follow IRB guidelines for retention of Healthcare Data</b></p>	<p><b>Contact Chair of Institutional Review Board and/or department or school representative</b></p>
<p><b>Type of Document: Sensitive</b></p>	<p><b>Level of Protection</b></p>	<p><b>Recommended Storage</b></p>	<p><b>Retention Time</b></p>	<p><b>Resources and Web Links</b></p>
<p><b><u>Student Documents</u></b> Letters of Recommendation, student papers and other academic related products, emails from students containing personal information or documents.</p>	<p><b>Moderate Confidentiality</b> Shared with permission &amp; limited usage. Permission specifies level of confidentiality, time frame of permission, and recommended storage guidelines.</p>	<p>May vary depending on the nature of the document and permissions received to distribute or share</p>	<p><b>Recommended 3-5 year retention, with extension based on immediate or long-term needs</b></p> <p><b>Student Work retained for 1-2 years</b></p>	<p><b>Academic Standards Committee</b></p> <p><b>Dean of Students Office</b></p> <p><b>Professional Standards</b></p> <p><b>Individual Department Guidelines</b></p>



<p><b><u>Faculty and Staff Professional Documents</u></b> Faculty Evaluation Letters, Letters from Evaluation Committees, Committee notes from review or disciplinary boards or petition committees. materials used for recruitment of potential employees and faculty (often includes CVs and letters of recommendation)</p>	<p><b>Moderate-High Confidentiality</b> Shared with permission &amp; limited usage. Permission specifies level of confidentiality, time frame of permission, and recommended storage guidelines.</p>	<p>Letters of Evaluation and disciplinary actions should be treated with the highest level of confidentiality, stored in locked filing cabinets and encrypted drives.</p>	<p><b>Recommended 3-5 year retention, with extension based on immediate or long-term needs</b></p>	<p><b>Professional Standards Committee</b>  <b>Office of the University Provost</b></p>
<p><b><u>Other Professional Documents (Outside University Roles)</u></b> Examples-Letters of recommendation or evaluation for colleagues outside the university; correspondence for reviewing academic articles, books, or grant proposals; correspondence and documents related to positions in professional organizations; professional financial documents such as book contracts; Letters for colleagues outside the university,</p>	<p><b>Variable Levels of Confidentiality</b> depending on the type of document, purpose, or organization. May be confidential.</p>	<p>May vary depending on the document type. If stored on UPS systems (digital or paper), review annually. Remove if no longer needed or can be stored securely elsewhere. Faculty may use "University Storage" for some of these materials</p>	<p><b>Recommended 3-5 year retention, with extension based on immediate or long-term needs</b></p>	<p><b>Professional Standards Committee</b>  <b>Faculty may also consult with professional organizations or ethics committees for best practices and standards in their field.</b></p>
<p><b><u>Personal materials belonging to faculty and staff such as financial information</u></b></p>	<p><b>Varies depending on the type of document, and purpose.</b></p>	<p><b>Varies depending on the type of document, purpose.</b>  <b>Do Not Store:</b> on University share drive, university computers, or in the university email system. The University share drive, computers, and email are engineered and managed to address FERPA concerns. The University cannot be responsible for the personal financial information of faculty and staff stored on University resources.</p>	<p><b>Determined by Individual Faculty</b></p>	<p><b>Professional Standards and Tech Services Policies may need to clarify further.</b></p>
<p><b>Materials of Interest to University Archives</b></p>	<p>Materials (proposals, brochures, photos, historical records, letters) associated with university</p>	<p><b>DO:</b> Retain in original form if possible and contact librarian for guidance on sharing, storage, retention time, and</p>	<p><b>Please consult with University Librarian or Archivist for guidance.</b></p>	<p><b>Contact Person: Jane Carlin, University Librarian</b>  <b>Other Contacts: Library Archivist</b></p>

	traditions, events, initiatives, artistic and intellectual performances, student organizations, portfolios etc.	location.		<b>(Adriana Flores) or Assistant Archivist (Laura Edgar)</b>
--	---	-----------	--	--

## GLOSSARY:

1. **Encryption** – Encryption can refer to the encryption of data in motion or the encryption of data at rest. The encryption of data in motion is most often seen when visiting a website where the address is preceded by `https` versus the unsecure `http`. Encryption of data at rest is also known as hard-drive encryption which is encryption when the data stored on a hard drive is protected using mathematical algorithms designed to obfuscate it. Data on an encrypted hard drive cannot be read by anyone who does not have access to the appropriate key or password. Encryption methods differ depending on if you want to encrypt a Mac or PC or a mobile device.
2. **External hard-drive** – An external hard drive is a portable storage device that can be attached to a computer through a USB or other external means. External hard drives typically have high storage capacities and are often used to back up computers or serve as added file storage for large files such as video and audio files.
3. **FERPA** – The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act is a federal law that protects the privacy of student education records. Detailed information can be found at the following link:  
<https://www2.ed.gov/policy/gen/guid/fpco/ferpa/index.html>.
4. **HIPAA** – The Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act sets the standard for protecting sensitive patient data. Any company that deals with protected health information must ensure that all the required physical, network, and process security measures are in place and followed.
5. **Home directory** – A home directory refers to the network file share where a user's files can be backed up or stored. Your home directory at Puget Sound is located at `stafffiles.pugetsound.edu/username`.
6. **IRB** – The Institutional Research Board serves as an objective third party, an oversight committee, governed by federal regulations with the purpose of protecting and managing risk to human participants involved in research.

7. **Network file share**—A network file share is server storage space accessible on a network with different levels of access privileges. Individuals or groups may have access to specific file shares. File shares can be mapped from a user's computer, creating a shortcut link to access that specific file share and may be referred to by the letter the file share is mapped to, for example the "P" drive.
8. **University data**—University data includes digital data contained on the Learning Management System (LMS), e-portfolio system, the streaming media server, and other university provided academic software systems. Any data created while performing work associated with the university is data that is technically owned by the institution and thus referred to as university data. This also includes all emails and documentation relevant to university business.

## **APPENDIX: GUIDELINES FOR DOCUMENTS OF LASTING AND PERMANENT VALUE TO THE UNIVERSITY**

While this document primarily focuses on the management of personal documentation, please keep in mind that some resources generated by you or your department may be appropriate for the University Archives. Many documents are important to retain as part of the lasting and permanent record of academic life at the University of Puget Sound. Academic departments are encouraged to establish guidelines for the retention of materials associated with their work. The Archivist & Special Collections Librarian is available to work with your department to establish a records retention program. Recommended guidelines for the retention of academic department records, developed by the Archives & Special Collections, can be found at the following link: <https://www.pugetsound.edu/academics/academic-resources/collins-memorial-library/archives/acad-dept-rec-guidelines/>. Materials of enduring historical value such as course syllabi, reports and planning documents, department histories, newsletters and other publications as well as records documenting major events may be appropriate for transfer to the Archives & Special Collections. Please contact [archives@pugetsound.edu](mailto:archives@pugetsound.edu).