

**Faculty Senate
McCormick Room, Collins Library
Minutes of the December 5, 2016 meeting**

In attendance:

Kris Bartanen; Nancy Bristow; Gwynne Brown; Kena Fox Dobbs; Bill Haltom; Robin Jacobson; Kristin Johnson; Alisa Kessel; Brendan Lanctot; Noah Lumbantobing; Pierre Ly; Emelie Peine; Siddharth Ramakrishnan; Mike Segawa; Shirley Skeel; Peter Wimberger.

Guest: Jennifer Neighbors

Call to order: 4:01pm

1. Announcements: Shirley, Emily and Kena will be leaving the Faculty Senate. We are grateful for their service.

2. Motion to approve minutes from Nov. 7th

Minutes passed.

3. Updates from Liaisons to Standing committees

Robin: Curriculum Committee:

- Review of proposals for a Bachelor in Liberal Studies degree program for students at the Washington Corrections Center for Women. This will allow them to earn a Puget Sound degree (women are currently able to earn an AA through Tacoma Community College).
- Recommended a Faculty Bylaws amendment to adjust the curriculum review cycle from 5 to 7 years.
- Update on charge on reconsidering the length of spring term, (either reducing by 1 week or 2 weeks). Based on back and forth - committee voted to consider option D as well.

Siddharth: IRB: The IRB subcommittee met with the IACUC chair to determine if the Animal Care and Use committee needs to be a stand alone one or fall under the IRB. It was recommended that the IACUC be made a stand alone committee.

Nancy: PSC (In addition to agenda): They responded to two inquiries:

- Can the head officer submit a minority report with regards to a promotion when a departmental recommendation is tied? Clarification: A minority report is allowed when a departmental vote is tied, in order that the position of the head officer is clear to the evaluatee.
- Newly approved department evaluation criteria take hold next academic year. Does this apply to all evaluations during that year? Clarification: PSC says departments have flexibility in interpreting these.

Peter Wimberger: IEC –

- Finished discussing revisions to standing charges. Will be on the agenda for spring

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

Staff Senate:

- Staff Compensation Committee is going to Budget Task Force with a request for a 4% increase in the staff salary pool. An increase in the salary pool does not mean that everyone gets that increase, as a portion may be used for market or internal equity adjustments.
- There has been more than 2.5% pool increase from last year.

ASUPS:

- Thanks for the resolution on sanctuary campus. Students are grateful for faculty to take a stance.
- Noah Lumbantobing distributed copies of a letter published in *The Trail* 3 years ago by Mariana Molina. It illustrates the power differential that exists between students/faculty/community.
- ASUPS would like to discuss what a Liberal Arts institution looks like within the context of today (what does it look like to intentionally provide spaces for healing, resilience and resisting?).

4. Jennifer Neighbors from PSC:

- PSC recommends an 8-year review cycle for departmental faculty evaluation criteria.
- Current Review cycle – there is currently not one for department evaluation standards.
- PSC has now created an 8-year review cycle. Departments will be expected to review standards - 2 in Fall and 2 in Spring. Revised standards will be submitted to PSC by midterm. PSC will then review those guidelines with feedback.
- Departments implement new review standards. How can colleagues hired under older standards be evaluated under new standards? How will departments address this?
- Looking at curriculum review schedule, PSC has identified a schedule to try to ensure that departments don't have to do both reviews simultaneously. The schedule begins with those departments and programs whose evaluation guidelines have not been reviewed for the longest period of time.

Questions:

If departments decided to update guidelines prior to the complete 8 year cycle, would they need to be reviewed again? It is possible that only the updates will be reviewed and they need not go through the entire process if they were only recently reviewed by the PSC.

When under PSC review, it is possible that long standing departmental standards could be approved or disapproved. The concern was raised that if the PSC changes year to year, standards that passed guideline review one year may not pass muster the next.

There was discussion regarding the grandfather clause – what criteria would faculty hired under one set of department standards get evaluated on, after review guidelines changed? The current practice of each department deciding on this review criteria came up for debate – Could departments foreclose the promotion and/or tenure of a colleague? Should there be universal

standards across departments? It was brought up that if the goal of evaluation standards is to reduce variability, it may not be pertinent to allow departments or individuals to decide what evaluation criteria should be used. Currently when a department makes changes, all colleagues are expected to be involved so that they are not caught by surprise. Could faculty choose the set of guidelines for their evaluation, similar to students choosing which bulletins they wish to use for graduation guidelines?

Based on the discussion, a motion was passed asking the PSC to reconsider the language regarding the evaluation cycle (Item 2 on last page).

(The PSC report is in Appendix)

6. Discussion of motion to create *in memoriam* recognition for students

There was a motion to create an *in memoriam* recognition for students during graduation.

This would pave the way to recognize students who passed away while attending the university. This would not be an honorary or posthumous degree, but a way to acknowledge people who are absent during commencement due to death.

The eligibility criteria for this recognition were discussed. It was suggested that students who were enrolled in the university at the time of death, but not dismissed or suspended, would be eligible after approval by the senate and board of trustees.

The main points of discussion were regarding how the recognition would be made, the eligibility criteria, and who would decide on the list of students.

The process of creating this list of students was discussed – as to whether the committee on honorary degrees and the faculty senate had to both approve of the list.

A main debating point was the language regarding “death while committing felony” – Students who fell under that criterion would not be recognized. The questions raised were regarding what constitutes a felony, and who decides if a felony was committed. The question of student suspension and if suspended students qualified was also discussed.

It was moved to postpone the motion.

7. Updates from senate sub-committees:

A. Subcommittee on Promotion language to full professor:

The subcommittee has met with Ellen Peters in IR and devised a plan for surveying faculty and will be meeting with Monica DeHart and Jennifer Neighbors before deciding on the questions. Next semester Ellen and IR will form focus groups involving different groups of faculty. Information from both the survey and focus groups will be used to put together some models to take to faculty regarding amending the code.

B. Subcommittee on Work life balance:

It will meet with Ellen Peters and Brad Tomhave to come up with data regarding numbers of advisees spread across departments and the number of independent research projects, summer, course loads and course releases distributed across departments. A worker satisfaction survey of faculty was discussed. They will look into such surveys at other universities and use data from the Higher Education Research Institute faculty survey. The subcommittee also discussed reframing the conversation regarding work-life balance in terms of what kinds of things show up on website, what is said on campus tours and experiential learning. Questions regarding equity amongst departments with regards to advising, hiring, evaluations and community service was raised.

C. Subcommittee on Common period:

First Wednesdays of each month will be reserved for faculty meetings. They were thinking about events that could be campus wide on other Wednesdays, such as workshops, “year of the XX” with different themes, etc. The evaluation group is in discussion with Brad Tomhave regarding class waitlists in the spring and classroom availability. They raised concerns about student access to courses, and impact on smaller programs and second majors. A Spring survey asking questions such as "did you get classes you needed", "what precluded you from finishing" etc. was recommended.

Meeting adjourned at 5:30pm

Minutes prepared by Siddharth Ramakrishnan

Respectfully submitted,

Pierre Ly

Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Attachments:

Appendix A: Mariana Molina Letter to the Editor

Appendix B: Review Cycle for Departmental Evaluation Standards

Appendix C: *In memoriam* recognition

search...

- [About The Trail](#)
- [Staff](#)
- [Apply for The Trail](#)
- [Advertise With Us](#)
- [Letters to the Editor](#)
- [Contact Us](#)



- [News](#)
- [Opinions](#)
- [Features](#)
- [Sports](#)
- [Arts & Entertainment](#)
- [The Happy Trail](#)
- [Combat Zone](#)

[Opinions](#)

[Letter to the Editor, Vol. 103, Issue 13](#)

Posted by [Zach Okamura](#) on March 26, 2014 at 3:24 PM

A Public Letter to the faculty and administration of the University of Puget Sound,

I am writing this letter out of concern. Lately, there has been a lot of talk about increasing the diversity on this campus, but to be honest, I hope that the University of Puget Sound does not see an increase in its enrollment of students of color anywhere in the near future. This is due to the fact that I don't believe that this campus is fully prepared to support a truly diversified student body.

Before I expand on my concern, it is important to situate myself. I am undocumented. My parents brought me to this country when I was three years old, a decision they made out of pure necessity. They left behind their friends and family, a majority of whom they haven't seen since. It wasn't until I was 13 that I started to realize what it meant to be undocumented in this country; how my "illegal" status would affect me, my opportunities and my future. I learned that I wouldn't be able to get a license; board a plane, travel outside of the U.S. or hold the kind of job I wanted to. I couldn't do many of the things that my friends did. I was always having to lie when my friends asked why I wasn't having the same experiences they were. Rather than explaining to them that I couldn't, I would pretend that I didn't want those experiences- pretending made things easier for them. I couldn't explain to people that I was undocumented due to fear of my own deportation or the deportation of my parents.

When the executive order of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals was signed, some of the realities changed. I can drive and travel within the country. I have a social security number, but I still can't leave the country unless I want to exile myself for the next 10 years. When I got my letter granting me this new status two years ago, my housemates, rather than celebrating with me, became annoyed at all the noise I was making.

Thus, alienation is not a new sentiment in my life, but I have managed. I've learned to create a sense of community for myself. Never, however, have I felt as isolated as I have during my time at Puget Sound. This alienation arises from the following:

The university lacks a support system for students of color. This is lacking both within the student body, but most importantly it is lacking within the faculty. It is hard to develop the same kinds of relationships that my classmates have with their professors when they don't understand my experience or worse when I don't feel like I can share my experience with them and/or when I do share with faculty and I am misunderstood altogether by those I hope will be supportive. It is exhausting to have to explain why I didn't go on study abroad or why I am not applying to international programs. Our professors can be excellent mentors and resources, but how can they mentor students whose experiences they don't understand and don't show interest in understanding? We need to acknowledge the fact that if we want a diverse student body then we need to be willing to provide students with an understanding faculty that can truly support and guide them.

When the subject of privilege and race are brought up in the classroom, it is obvious that people become uncomfortable. Rather than unpacking this discomfort, the discussion will end. When something that I find offensive is said in class, I find myself keeping silent. This silence is not due to my lack of outrage or wanting to speak up. Rather, my silence is a product of my exhaustion and fear. After attempts to talk about whiteness, race, racism as imbricated power structures, there comes the inevitable comment of "not all white people are like that" or worse yet, the eye-rolling. Rather than taking a moment and being introspective about how our privileges may benefit us, we jump on the defensive and no intervention occurs.

I've spoken to some professors about how a term like "illegal alien" is dehumanizing. They have implied that I should be the one to speak out in class when the term is used. Furthermore, they have implied that it is my responsibility to call out any other microaggression. Why? To "not silence me or take away my agency." What they fail to understand – beside the fact that the use of these terms are OUR problem and not just my own – is that on this campus, I've never felt safe speaking up. Speaking up results in feeling alienated. As a product of faculty not being willing to advocate on behalf of students during these moments, the burden then falls onto the student. And let me tell you, the burden is enormous.

There is resistance to conversations of race/ethnicity, privilege and power. Often times, we do not engage on these topics due to the discomfort of the majority. In doing so, we are silencing the already isolated and alienated voices on campus. Yes, there are members of our campus community who

are willing to engage, but it's not enough. The proposed diversity curriculum is a small step in the right direction, but if we want to create an environment in which students of color feel supported, we need to bring diversity to the faculty.

I am leaving UPS angry and disappointed. As things stand now, I will not recommend this university to other undocumented students or students of color. What I have written here is only my own experience but certain aspects of my letter have resonated and continue to resonate with other students. Beyond that, I write this letter in an attempt to bring about change. UPS has enormous potential and I would love to see us all live up to it.

Thank you for your time,

Mariana Molina

Tags: [alienation](#), [diversity](#), [Puget Sound](#), [undocumented immigrants](#)

- [Tweet](#)
- [J'aime 0](#)
- [G+1](#) [0](#)

Author: [Zach Okamura](#)

Leave a Reply

Your email address will not be published. Required fields are marked *

Comment

Your Name *

Your Email *

Your Website

Related Posts

- [The misconception of economic diversity at University of Puget Sound](#) November 8, 2015
- [Giving a Voice to the Undocumented](#) March 27, 2015
- [Undocumented Students' Experience at Puget Sound](#) March 27, 2015
- [Take advantage of the University's religious services](#) March 6, 2015

Archives

- [December 2016](#)
- [November 2016](#)
- [October 2016](#)
- [September 2016](#)
- [May 2016](#)
- [April 2016](#)
- [February 2016](#)
- [December 2015](#)
- [November 2015](#)
- [October 2015](#)
- [May 2015](#)
- [April 2015](#)
- [March 2015](#)
- [February 2015](#)
- [December 2014](#)
- [November 2014](#)
- [October 2014](#)
- [September 2014](#)
- [May 2014](#)
- [April 2014](#)
- [March 2014](#)
- [February 2014](#)
- [December 2013](#)
- [November 2013](#)
- [October 2013](#)
- [September 2013](#)
- [May 2013](#)
- [April 2013](#)
- [March 2013](#)
- [February 2013](#)
- [December 2012](#)
- [November 2012](#)
- [October 2012](#)

- [September 2012](#)
- [August 2012](#)
- [April 2012](#)
- [March 2012](#)
- [February 2012](#)
- [December 2011](#)
- [November 2011](#)
- [October 2011](#)
- [September 2011](#)
- [July 2011](#)
- [May 2011](#)
- [April 2011](#)
- [March 2011](#)
- [February 2011](#)
- [December 2010](#)
- [November 2010](#)
- [October 2010](#)
- [September 2010](#)

- [About The Trail](#)
- [News](#)
- [Opinions](#)
- [Features](#)
- [Sports](#)
- [A&E](#)
- [Happy Trail](#)
- [Combat Zone](#)

Designed by [WPZOOM](#) Copyright © 2016 — [The Trail](#). All Rights Reserved.

DATE: November 8, 2016

FROM: Professional Standards Committee

TO: Faculty Senate

SUBJECT: Review Cycle for Departmental Evaluation Standards

As part of its standing charge “to recommend and improve continually the instruments and methods of Faculty evaluation and to facilitate their use in the University community” (Faculty Bylaws V.6.E.c.1), the Professional Standards Committee (PSC) has established a review cycle whereby each university department will be asked to review and revise its departmental evaluation procedures (i.e. its departmental guidelines for promotion, tenure, and other reviews). This review is meant to help ensure that departmental evaluation standards stay up-to-date with the Faculty Code as well as changing norms and practices within each discipline.

After reviewing information on when each department last conducted a formal review of its departmental evaluation standards, the PSC has established a rolling schedule whereby each department will conduct such a review once every eight years:

<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Year One</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">(first review in spring 2017)</p> <p>Environmental Policy and Decision Making (fall)</p> <p>Hispanic Studies (spring)</p> <p>Economics (spring)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Year Two</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">(first review in 2017-2018)</p> <p>Classics (fall)</p> <p>German Studies (fall)</p> <p>Geology (spring)</p> <p>History (spring)</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Year Three</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">(first review in 2018-2019)</p> <p>Religious Studies (fall)</p> <p>Exercise Science (fall)</p> <p>Psychology (spring)</p> <p>Sociology and Anthropology (spring)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Year Four</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">(first review in 2019-2020)</p> <p>Science, Technology, and Society (fall)</p> <p>African American Studies (fall)</p> <p>Theatre (spring)</p> <p>Chemistry (spring)</p>

<u>Year Five</u> (first review in 2020-2021)	<u>Year Six</u> (first review in 2021-2022)
International Political Economy (fall)	Physics (fall)
Education (fall)	Politics and Government (fall)
Communication Studies (spring)	Music (spring)
Asian Languages and Cultures (spring)	Mathematics and Computer Science (spring)
<u>Year Seven</u> (first review in 2022-2023)	<u>Year Eight</u> (first review in 2023-2024)
Philosophy (fall)	Physical Therapy (fall)
Biology (fall)	French Studies (fall)
Business and Leadership (spring)	Occupational Therapy (spring)
English (spring)	Art and Art History (spring)

Departments will be required to submit their revised standards to the PSC for review no later than midterm of their assigned semester.

If a department finds it important to review or change its departmental standards earlier than its designated review year, it is free to submit revised guidelines to the PSC at any time. However, the department will still need to conduct a review during its next regular, designated review year.

Guidelines to Departments

As departments conduct their reviews, the PSC asks them to consider, among other issues, the following:

- Whether there are any unclear or contradictory statements that might mislead or confuse a junior or newly-arrived faculty member, or that could confuse the Faculty Advancement Committee (FAC) when attempting to apply the guidelines.
- Whether there are rules that are overly restrictive, and that could delay an evaluation or force the FAC to return a file to the department. The PSC recommends modifiers like "normally" to allow for illness, leaves of absence, etc.

- Whether norms and practices in the relevant discipline(s) have changed since the last review of their departmental standards, and if so, how departmental standards should be revised to reflect those new norms and practices.
- Whether any aspects of the guidelines contradict provisions in the Faculty Code, especially Chapters III and IV. The PSC asks that departments pay particular attention to several issues:
 - The specification of criteria for tenure and promotion are not the same.
 - Colleague letters are to be completed before department deliberations.
 - Where standard departmental practice is to establish an evaluation committee that is smaller than the whole department or includes members of other departments/programs, departments should provide guidelines for the composition of that evaluation committee, making sure that its composition accords with provisions outlined in Chapter III, Section IV, Part III of the Faculty Code.
 - Departments are reminded that only tenure-line faculty, ongoing instructors, and clinical faculty may participate in the evaluation process.
 - Departments should ensure that all aspects of departmental guidelines accord with the most recent version of the Faculty Code.
 - References to page numbers in the Faculty Code should be avoided, since those numbers can change, invalidating guidelines.

Evaluation standards should also indicate the following:

1. The names of the faculty members who participated in the process of revising the departmental evaluation standards.
2. The department's anticipated schedule for implementing the new standards. According to the Faculty Evaluation Procedures and Criteria, "[n]ewly approved departmental criteria for evaluation, tenure, and promotion normally take effect at the beginning of the next academic year following PSC approval." In some cases departments may find that this would disadvantage colleagues who began a review period under one set of evaluation expectations and will end an evaluation period under a different set of evaluation expectations. Departments may propose a rolling implementation schedule for new evaluation standards, but that schedule must be detailed in the evaluation standards document.

Final copies of guidelines should include the date of departmental approval and the date of PSC approval.

***In memoriam* recognition**

Objective: to create an *in memoriam* recognition to be awarded to students who have died while enrolled at the University of Puget Sound.

To be eligible, students must:

- 1) have matriculated at the University of Puget Sound, and have been attending classes and actively pursuing and making progress towards a degree at the time of death, or between terms in such enrollment,
- 2) not have been dismissed or suspended at the time of death, and
- 3) not have died while committing a felony.

The *in memoriam* recognition would be granted, upon consultation and approval from the student's family, at the Commencement ceremony (or at another time agreed upon by the family) that corresponds either to the student's anticipated graduation date or to the class with which the student matriculated.

This recognition will not affect the academic or honorary merits of other degrees awarded by the university and will not require an accounting of the student's academic achievements to date (other than as specified in #1 and #2 above). The *in memoriam* recognition would not preclude an individual from being awarded an honorary degree, if appropriate.

The Committee on Honorary Degrees will determine eligibility for *in memoriam* recognition and will make recommendations, as appropriate, to the Faculty Senate.