

Minutes of the January 22, 2020 faculty meeting

Respectfully submitted by John Wesley, Secretary of the Faculty

Attendance: Faculty members and guests in attendance are listed in Appendix A of these minutes.

I. Call to order

Chair Freeman called the meeting to order at 12:02 p.m., at which time there were seventy-four voting members present.

II. Announcements

There was an announcement reminding faculty to encourage students to submit their essays for consideration in the writing excellence awards.

III. Approval of the November 20, 2019 minutes

The minutes of the November 20, 2019 faculty meeting were approved as circulated.

IV. Questions regarding the report from the Faculty Senate Chair

The report is included in Appendix B of these minutes.

One member noted poor acoustics in the room and asked to return the meetings to McIntyre 103. Chair Freeman replied that McIntyre 103 only fits 130 people, and many more faculty have come to meetings recently when discussing and voting on curricular matters. Upper Marshall Hall can handle this attendance in such a way that faculty can all be seated comfortably.

V. Postponed business: motion to revise Faculty Code language regarding promotion to full professor

The background, rationale, and language of the motion is included in Appendix C of these minutes. A side-by-side comparison of the current language and proposed revision is included in Appendix D of these minutes. The passed (amended) language of Part II of the motion occurs at the end of this item's record of discussion.

Chair Freeman provided the background to the motion and reasons for its previous postponement, and mentioned four options going forward: we could a) discuss the motion in this meeting and vote to pass it, b) vote immediately to pass it with the understanding the faculty who designed it did their due diligence, c) discuss the motion and vote it down, or d) withdraw the motion and remove it from consideration, meaning we would not be obligated to return to it at a certain date. Chair Freeman then read the language of the motion and clarified that, if passed, it would take effect in the year following the vote and only with respect to tenure-line faculty who join that year, and therefore not to any current tenure-line faculty.

It was **moved** by Joshi, and **seconded**, *to return the motion to the present assembly and pass it*. Joshi noted that the issues that the revision is designed to solve persist, particularly for those trying to interpret the current language for promotion in their evaluation of files. Joshi also did not see how the conversation on the curriculum in any way altered the problem, so did not advise delaying .

President Crawford addressed the faculty. He said that he was not speaking in favor or in opposition to the motion, but asked the faculty to consider, first, that the phrase “scholarly activity” might not adequately target the many different kinds of activities pursued by our faculty, including artistic endeavors and performances; and, second, in terms of the timing of its implementation, the likelihood of confusion and divisiveness should the faculty pursue promotion decisions with two different available sets of criteria in the Code. He asked for some clarification of the Faculty Senate’s thought process in terms of the transition period, noting that other institutions have implemented new criteria five or six years after approving a revision, while others have moved faculty immediately to the new standards.

Chair Freeman responded that department guidelines for evaluation define scholarly activity in ways that reflect the unique kind of work done by their faculty, which can include artistic and performance activities, as appropriate to the discipline or program.

It was **moved in amendment** by Neshyba, and **seconded**, *to replace “scholarly activity” with “professional growth” in the bottom paragraph*. As Chair Freeman pointed out, passing this amendment would synchronize the language of item (2) and the language of the bottom paragraph.

Two members spoke in favor of the amendment, noting that “professional growth” is the language that is standard in the Faculty Code, and that it already appears in most department guidelines for evaluation.

There was no further discussion.

The Neshyba amendment **passed** on a voice vote.

A number of members returned to the question of broadening the language for professional growth, and reiterated that departments have leeway in their own guidelines to define that growth as appropriate to the activities of their members.

The discussion turned to matters of implementation. One member felt that the revision should be passed and that it should apply immediately to all current faculty as well. Another member said that there is transition language built into department guidelines stating that the criteria cannot be changed between one’s evaluations. In response to a question about an implementation motion that was passed two years ago, Chair Freeman clarified that this passed language gives us the option to stagger and amend changes to implementation, but does not mandate a particular course of action in that regard.

Several members who spoke in favor of the motion cited their approval of joining advising and mentorship to teaching in proposed item (1), since a) it renders visible the often invisible work that finds its way into statements of evaluation, and b) there is no metric to evaluate advising as a stand-alone criterion (as it is in the current Faculty Code language). One member, however, expressed concern that an activity with no clear metric of evaluation would be elevated and added to the first and therefore most important criterion for evaluation. Chair Freeman suggested that the Faculty Senate can charge the PSC to develop interpretive language for how to respond to advising if the motion were to pass, and that the PSC could then ask departments to review their guidelines to address advising accordingly. One member proposed a solution (without moving an amendment) by changing the language of item 1 to read, “teaching and related responsibilities, which may include the mentoring and advising of students.” Another disagreed, mentioning that the elevation and addition of advising forces the faculty to come up with better evaluations of teaching that could also address mentoring. A member of a program in the sciences expressed concern that the privileging of academic advising over the research advising that often happens in these programs might put these faculty at a disadvantage in terms of professional growth. Chair Freeman responded that there is latitude for departments to narrate different types of emphasis with respect to advising.

There was discussion of the phrase “significant contribution to the university” within the category of service, which revises the current language referring to “distinguished service.” One member argued that the revised language lowers the bar for service, since “significant” is a weaker evaluative term than “distinguished.” Another member, however, preferred the proposed revision, but noted that most department guidelines currently have the language of “distinguished service,” so there may need to be a rollout time that would allow for updating these documents prior to implementation. This member suggested a five- or seven-year gap to implementation for tenure-line faculty hired before the revised language was in place. One member recollected a survey collected some years ago that indicated departments interpret service quite differently across the university. With respect to item (3) parts a) and b), this member registered approval of the amendment, arguing that it clarifies the importance of significant university service in particular, something that should not be displaced by community service (as may well happen under the current criteria), which is easier to attain, and the favored pursuit of which often leaves the more difficult university service to fall on junior faculty.

It was **moved in amendment** by Liao, and **seconded**, *to insert the phrase “and related responsibilities [add comma]” after “excellence in teaching” in the bottom paragraph.*

There was no discussion of the amendment.

The Liao amendment **passed** on a voice vote.

It was **moved in amendment** by Udbye, and **seconded**, *to replace (in the last phrase of the bottom paragraph) “contribution to the university” with “contribution to their profession or their larger community.”*

Two members spoke against the amendment for the reason that it might privilege community service at the expense of university service, thereby putting the burden of the latter on junior

faculty in particular. One member spoke for the amendment because community service is integral to the day-to-day and scholarly work of some programs. Another member, speaking against the motion, responded that it was important to leave room in the Faculty Code for departments to make their own arguments and guidelines for service, or for candidates to make their own case in this regard.

There was no further discussion of the amendment.

The Udbye amendment **failed** on a voice vote.

It was **moved in amendment** by Colbert-White, and **seconded**, *that the implementation language of Part I of the motion should read as follows: “the revised language will apply to current pre-tenure faculty and faculty joining the tenure line in the academic year following the approval of the revised language.”*

Three members spoke against the amendment, arguing that it was unfair to current pre-tenure faculty. One of these members suggested a five-year implementation delay.

There was no further discussion of the amendment.

The Colbert-White amendment **failed** on a voice vote.

It was **moved in amendment** by Weisz, and **seconded**, that the implementation language of Part I of the motion should read as follows: “the revised language will apply to all faculty beginning five years after the approval of this motion.”

Given the target of the two recent motions to amend, and in the interest of efficiency, one member suggested that the assembly divide the question according to the motion’s two parts.

Weisz **withdrew the motion to amend**.

It was **moved** by DeHart, and **seconded**, *to divide the question, as follows: Motion 1 (Part I: Implementation) and Motion 2 (Part II: Proposed Language for Revision to the Faculty Code (at III.3.e), as amended in the current meeting), with Motion 1 to be considered at a later date.*

There was no discussion.

The motion to divide the question **passed** on a voice vote.

There was no further discussion.

Motion 2 **passed** on a voice vote.

The language for promotion (Part II of the original motion) was therefore passed as follows (i.e., including passed amendments):

Faculty promotion shall be based upon the quality of a person's performance of academic duties. Because the university seeks the highest standards for faculty advancement, mere satisfactory performance is no guarantee of promotion. Appointment in the rank of associate professor and professor normally requires a doctoral or other equivalent terminal degree.

Decisions whether to promote shall be based upon the quality of the faculty member's performance in the following areas, listed in order of importance:

(1) teaching and related responsibilities, including the mentoring and advising of students;

(2) professional growth;

(3) participation in service a) to the university, and b) to one's profession or, in ways related to one's professional interests and expertise, to the larger community.

Promotion to the rank of full professor requires a candidate to have maintained excellence in teaching and related responsibilities, and demonstrated significant professional growth since promotion to associate. Within the category of service, candidates for promotion to the rank of full professor must provide evidence of a continued and significant contribution to the university.

VI. Motion to amend the educational goals

The language of the motion is included in [Appendix E](#).

There was a point of order. Neshyba clarified that motions made by a body or committee (such as the Faculty Senate in this instance) do not require a second.

One member asked how "diverse fields of knowledge" (in part d. of the educational goals) might apply to specialized graduate programs like Physical Therapy, for example. Two members clarified that graduate programs at Puget Sound do need to answer to the goal of diverse fields of knowledge, and that this amendment would work to make that goal visible.

There was no further discussion.

The motion **passed** on a voice vote.

VII. Update from the University Chaplain on religious observances and recent conversations within the United Methodist Church

University Chaplain Dave Wright took the floor to update the faculty on new laws regarding religious observances, as well as on the significance of recent conversations within the United Methodist Church. With respect to the latter, he mentioned that some inaccurate reporting in the latter may have led people to believe that the UMC has agreed to a division within the church

according to beliefs about same-sex marriage and ordination. Wright said he hoped for such an outcome but that this division has not occurred; however, there will be a vote on this issue at the United Methodist General Conference this May.

Regarding campus policies on accommodations for student religious observances, Wright reported that the university is compliant with the law passed by the Washington State Legislature requiring a policy for student absences for reasons of faith-based holidays, one that would mean grades would not be affected. Wright read from a summary of the law, which also requires the inclusion of the policy in every syllabus. He mentioned that the policy is available online, and a link (with further information) would be provided shortly in an email, along with a calendar of religious observances with the most likely or potential impact for our community.

VIII. Other business

There was no other business.

IX. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 1:27 p.m.

Appendix A - Attendance

Faculty Meeting Attendance – January 22, 2020

Rich Anderson-Connolly
Gareth Barkin
Terence Beck
Laura Behling
Francoise Belot
Luc Boisvert
Nancy Bristow
Gwynne Brown
Dan Burgard
David Chiu
Lynnette Claire
Erin Colbert-White
Johanna Crane
Isiaah Crawford
Monica DeHart
James Evans
Sara Freeman
Dexter Gordon
Jeffrey Grinstead
William Haltom
Susannah Hannaford
John Hanson
David Hanson
Jennifer Hastings
Darcy Irvin
Greg Johnson
Priti Joshi
Tatiana Kaminsky
Diane Kelley
Nick Kontogeorgopoulos
Laura Krughoff
Sunil Kukreja
John Lear
Shen-Yi Liao
Julia Looper
Pierre Ly
Janet Marcavage
Jeff Matthews
Gary McCall

Jill McCourt
Danny McMillian
Amanda Mifflin
Sarah Moore
Wendell Nakamura
Steven Neshyba
Eric Orlin
Emelie Peine
Jennifer Pitonyak
Michael Pohl
Jacob Price
Sara Protasi
Elise Richman
Brett Rogers
Amy Ryken
Leslie Saucedo
Dan Sherman
Katherine Smith
Amy Van Engen Spivey
Karin Steere
Kristen Strehle
Yvonne Swinth
Justin Tiehen
Andreas Udbye
Jennifer Utrata
Kurt Walls
Seth Weinberger
Carolyn Weisz
John Wesley
Heather White
Kirsten Wilbur
Linda Williams
Peter Wimberger
Carrie Woods
Sheryl Zylstra

Guests

Heather Bailey
Kelli Delaney
Susan Owen
Landon Wade

Appendix B - Report from the Faculty Senate Chair

Report to the Faculty

Sara Freeman, Chair of Faculty Senate

January 15, 2019

Dear Colleagues:

This month, the two weeks before classes have been humming with workshops and interviews for our VP of Enrollment. We all know there's a lot going on. I have scheduled faculty meetings accordingly: I added several to our spring calendar in December. I was able to cancel the meeting I had added in December, but I am choosing the tactic that is better to hold the space for the meetings and cancel when we are able rather than scramble for time for our continuing curriculum work.

I am using the meeting on January 22 in particular to make sure we have done business we need to do before the next round of recommendations from the CTF come to the faculty meeting floor. CTF has taken the direction the faculty provided through its vote and continued the work on its charges and the motions we passed in May of 2019. We will return to that work on February 5.

On January 22, our most key piece of business is to vote on a motion to change the wording of our Educational Goals to reflect the role of the graduate programs on our campus. This is not a proposed change to the faculty code, so there does not need to be a first and second reading of the motion. We can act on it when it is raised. Senate is bringing this motion to the faculty after hearing a proposal from the graduate faculty at our November 25 meeting. The graduate faculty made this proposal in response to discussion among faculty across campus as we explore the expansion of our graduate programs. Senate found this proposal to be elegant, simple, and profound in expressing how our graduate and undergraduate programs share educational goals.

I am also asking the faculty to return early to our postponed business regarding the motion to change the code language about promotion. If you recall, we postponed this motion twice. When we postpone a motion, we set a specific date to return to it. In our September 2019 meeting we postponed this motion to February 5. I am asking us to return to it early so we have more time at our Feb. 5 meeting. Our parliamentarian will advise us on the 22nd how best to handle this motion so we do not have to keep postponing it more.

We will also receive an update and hear a presentation I have been looking to make time for in faculty meeting so we can "clear the deck" for February and March.

Senate Report

Since our last Faculty meeting, here's what Senate has been up to:

We passed an interim religious observances policy and charged ASC with revising it and making it permanent. Some process toward such a policy had been underway in governance, but we

Appendix B - Report from the Faculty Senate Chair

needed to create an interim policy quickly to comply with changes in Washington State law. This is part of what Chaplain Dave Wright's update will be about in our meeting.

Next, Senate is at work on collaborating with President Crawford to form the search committee for the new Vice President of Diversity and Inclusion. Thank you to all of you who wrote with nominations of faculty members to serve as co-chair of the committee with Dr. Uchenna Baker. Senate will deliberate on the nominations and appoint a co-chair. After that, Senate will turn to identifying the faculty members who will serve on the search committee.

Senate will be receiving the Budget Task Force's report on January 27. Updates are rolling in from the PSC's work on Student Evaluations of Teaching, the ad hoc committee on contingent faculty, and the Faculty Development program efforts that are part of the UEC's charges this year. I expect we will be hearing about the Summer Bridge proposal that will come to CC soon as well. There are also requests for Senate to consider our land acknowledgement signage and the more effective structuring of common hour use for cross campus benefit that we will turn to as quickly as possible.

As noted, a lot is going on. And so, I will say a word about our next few months of work together. If we can hold our focus, we can make a lot of progress in expressing our values, serving our students, and setting ourselves up better to be an energized, coordinated community.

I hope we get a perfectly timed snow day or two, a mild February, and a big wave of spring energy as we go about synthesizing and wrapping up this year.

Sincerely,

Sara

Appendix C - Proposed Revision to the Faculty Code Regarding Promotion to Full Professor

A brief history of work to date

For several years, the Faculty Advancement Committee has noted (in its annual report to the Faculty Senate) discrepancies in how departments interpret the phrase in the Faculty Code regarding “distinguished service,” a requirement for promotion to the rank of (full) professor. The Faculty Senate charged the Professional Standards Committee (in around 2015-2016) to render an interpretation of the language. Upon surveying departments chairs, the PSC determined that departments were split in their interpretations: some applied the modifier “distinguished” only to service, while others believed that “distinguished” applied to other categories of review. Consequently, the PSC did not feel confident rendering a decisive interpretation, for to do so would have been to impose a culture change upon half of the faculty.

That left the option of revision of the Code. Because the PSC is the body that interprets the Code, the Faculty Senate determined that it should not also be charged with writing the Code. For this reason, the Faculty Senate took on the responsibility of crafting language to present to the faculty. In AY 2016-2017, in collaboration with the Faculty Senate, the Office of Institutional Research, conducted a survey of the faculty and three focus groups—one each at the rank of assistant, associate, and full professor.

In fall 2017, a committee of the Faculty Senate (Jacobson, Kessel, Kukreja, L. Livingston, MacBain, and Wilson) convened to draft language based on the findings from the survey and focus group data. The committee saw a wide range of perspectives in the survey results, but nevertheless saw a few ideas that it believed would be important to consider in revising the Code:

- the revision should clarify an expectation that applicants for promotion to full should both meet a minimum bar and provide evidence of an upward trajectory in each category of review;
- the revision should convey the idea that each career has seasons (to borrow the Provost’s language) and that, while applicants for promotion to full are expected to have demonstrated significant achievement in each category of review, they are not expected to do everything at a significant level all the time;
- the categories of review should be simplified.

The committee developed language, which it took first to the Professional Standards Committee and then, upon incorporating the PSC’s recommendations, to the Faculty Senate. After some discussion, the Faculty Senate revised the language once more. The Faculty Senate approved its own revisions of the language and voted to take the revised language to the full faculty for consideration.

The tenor of our deliberation

A concern was voiced in the Faculty Senate that faculty members at the assistant and associate levels could feel reluctant to speak candidly during the conversation of the full faculty for fear of being misinterpreted or unfairly judged. The Faculty Senate asks participants in the discussion to entertain all points of view and to invite, in particular, the input of those who

Appendix C - Proposed Revision to the Faculty Code Regarding Promotion to Full Professor

stand directly to be affected by a change to the requirements for promotion or the schedule of implementation of the change. The Faculty Senate asks, too, that participants commit to the generous interpretation and respectful consideration of one another's ideas.

The text of the motion

Procedurally, it feels important to the Faculty Senate that the implementation of the change be debated independent of the language of the revision itself. Therefore, the motion has two parts: part one concerns implementation and part two concerns the proposed revision.

PART I. IMPLEMENTATION

If the faculty and Trustees vote to revise the Faculty Code regarding promotion standards to the rank of full professor, the revised language will apply to tenure line faculty members who join the campus in the academic year following approval of the revised language. (For example, if passed in AY 2018-19, tenure line faculty who join the faculty in AY 2019-20 will be subject to the revised language). Faculty members who are on the tenure line prior to passage of the measure will be evaluated on the standards that existed in the Code when the faculty approved the measure.

The faculty requests that the Professional Standards Committee note this implementation measure in the Faculty Evaluation Procedures and Criteria document (formerly known as the "buff" document).

PART II. PROPOSED LANGUAGE FOR REVISION TO THE FACULTY CODE (at III.3.e), updated as of 12.3.18

"Faculty promotion shall be based upon the quality of a person's performance of academic duties. Because the university seeks the highest standards for faculty advancement, mere satisfactory performance is no guarantee of promotion. Appointment in the rank of associate professor and professor normally requires a doctoral or other equivalent terminal degree.

Decisions whether to promote shall be based upon the quality of the faculty member's performance in the following areas, listed in order of importance:

- (1) teaching and related responsibilities, including the mentoring and advising of students;
- (2) professional growth;
- (3) participation in service a) to the university, and b) to one's profession or, in ways related to one's professional interests and expertise, to the larger community.

Promotion to the rank of full professor requires a candidate to have maintained excellence in teaching and demonstrated significant scholarly activity since promotion to associate. Within the category of service, candidates for promotion to the rank of full professor must provide evidence of a continued and significant contribution to the university."

Appendix D - Promotion Language Side by Side

III.3.e

CURRENT

Faculty promotion shall be based upon the quality of a person's performance of academic duties. Specifically, decisions whether to promote shall be based upon the quality of the faculty member's performance in the following areas, listed in order of importance:

- (1) teaching;
- (2) professional growth;
- (3) advising students;
- (4) participation in university service; and
- (5) community service related to professional interests and expertise.

Because the university seeks the highest standards for faculty advancement, mere satisfactory performance is no guarantee of promotion. In addition, appointment in the rank of associate professor and professor normally requires a doctoral, or other equivalent terminal degree. **Advancement to the rank of full professor is contingent upon evidence of distinguished service in addition to sustained growth in the above-mentioned areas.**

DRAFT, updated as of 12.3.18

Faculty promotion shall be based upon the quality of a person's performance of academic duties. Because the university seeks the highest standards for faculty advancement, mere satisfactory performance is no guarantee of promotion. Appointment in the rank of associate professor and professor normally requires a doctoral or other equivalent terminal degree.

Decisions whether to promote shall be based upon the quality of the faculty member's performance in the following areas, listed in order of importance:

(1) teaching **and related responsibilities, including the mentoring and advising of students;**

(2) professional growth;

(3) participation in service a) to the university, and b) to one's profession or, in ways related to one's professional interests and expertise, to the larger community.

Promotion to the rank of full professor requires a candidate to have maintained excellence in teaching and demonstrated significant scholarly activity since promotion to associate. Within the category of service, candidates for promotion to the rank of full professor must provide evidence of a continued and significant contribution to the university.

Appendix E - Motion to Amend the University Educational Goals

Motion to Amend the University Educational Goals

The Faculty Senate Moves to amend the Educational Goals so they read:

“A student completing the undergraduate curriculum or a graduate program will be able to”

- a. think critically and creatively;
- b. communicate clearly and effectively, both orally and in writing;
- c. develop and apply knowledge both independently and collaboratively
and will have developed
- d. familiarity with diverse fields of knowledge and the ability to draw connections among them;
- e. solid grounding in the field of the student’s choosing;
- f. understanding of self, others, and influence in the world; and
- g. an informed and thoughtful sense of justice and a commitment to ethical action

The first sentence of the goals previous read:

A student completing the undergraduate curriculum will be able to

Amy E Ryken

Fri 10/18/2019 9:53 AM

To:

Sara E Freeman;

Cc:

Sunil Kukreja;

Danny McMillian;

Yvonne Swinth;

[Bing Maps](#)

Sara,

During the discussion of the [educational goals](#) questions arose about whether or not the goals applied to graduate programs or if graduate programs should have their own educational goals. In a recent meeting of the leadership of graduate programs, Sunil Kukreja, Dean of Graduate Studies, and the Provost Laura Behling we discussed this topic. As a part of the discussion Provost Behling suggested that a good next step might be to bring the topic forward to the Faculty Senate. We are reaching out to you to ask if this item can added to a Senate meeting agenda.

Our recommendation is that the sentence stem, just above the educational goals be revised,

Current Stem: A student completing the undergraduate curriculum will be able to

Proposed Revision: "A student completing the undergraduate curriculum or a graduate program will be able to"

For additional context, we considered one other possible revision to the stem, "'A student graduating from Puget Sound will be able to". We considered that the term "students" may be more inclusive of all students, but given the relative lack of visibility of the graduate programs and their values, it might be better to specifically name graduate programs since when the term "student" is used on our campus, most individuals automatically think undergraduate students.

Our primary rationale for this revision is that the current graduate programs are people and value centered and are well aligned with the existing educational goals. We believe these goals area a strong benchmark for assessing proposed new graduate programs fit with the university mission.

We look forward to conversation with the Senate,

Amy

Amy E. Ryken, Ph.D.

Dean and Distinguished Professor

School of Education

University of Puget Sound

1500 N. Warner Street, CMB #1051

Tacoma, WA 98416

aryken@pugetsound.edu

p: (253) 879-2810

f: (253) 879-3926

[School of Education website](#)

[School of Education blog](#)

[Race and Pedagogy National Conference](#)