

Faculty Senate
McCormick Room, Collins Library
Minutes of the April 2, 2018 meeting

Senate Members:

Kena Fox-Dobbs, Pierre Ly, Tiffany MacBain, Jung Kim, Sarah Walling-Bell, Andrew Monaco, Kris Bartenen, Gwynne Brown, Bill Beardsley, Peter Wimberger, Kristin Johnson, Sunil Kukreja, Amanda Diaz, Alisa Kessel, Anna Coy

Guests: Liz Collins, Beverly Conner, Darcy Irvin, David Hanson, Poppy Fry, Collin Noble, Suzanne Warren, Alicia Dueker, Lotus Perry, Steve Rodgers

1. The meeting was called to order at 12:02 pm

2. M/S/P to approve the minutes of March 19, 2018 as amended

3. Updates from ASUSP and Staff Senate

ASUPS:

This is the last meeting for Amanda Diaz; Collin Noble, the new ASUPS president whose appointment is effective later in the day following the formal induction, will be attending future faculty senate meetings

Emergency fund update: still soliciting ideas/support/feedback to create sources for students in need for airfare, textbooks, etc. Faculty are welcome to contribute to these funds and the Student Life Committee also is aware of the emergency fund initiative and wants to ensure that ASUPS stays in communication with the committee to move this forward

The anti-bias video has launched and can be found on the ASUPS webpage as well as on the University webpage.

Staff Senate:

Staff Senate elections will be underway starting next week.

The planning of the annual staff recognition luncheon is underway and the date of the luncheon has been moved to Friday, May 18, earlier than when it has taken place previously. The planning committee will be reaching out through facultycoms shortly for support at the event.

Nominations for the Excellence in Action Awards are open on the Staff Senate website

April 24-25 will be the annual gift basket raffle to benefit the Rosa Beth Gibson Book Scholarship.

4. Updates from Standing Committees

LMIS

Fox-Dobbs shared that the committee is close to producing a draft document for best practices for faculty on issues related to how to handle/store digital and hard copy documents.

The committee is scheduled to meet and decide how best to distribute/implement suggestions as outlined in the draft document and the Senate has been asked to also help determine the best strategy for implementation, specifically what to do with the document.

5. Receipt of Year-End Report from Student Life Committee (See Appendix A):

Charge to the SLC: In addition to the ongoing charges in the Faculty ByLaws, the Faculty Senate charges the SLC to assess (and make recommendations regarding) how the SLC might best facilitate the faculty's understanding of processes and procedures related to Student Affairs.

Poppy Fry from the committee gave the year-end report as follows:

- a) Many discussions were had regarding the best use of the SLC
The committee met monthly and felt that meeting more regularly would have more successful outcomes for the committee, but it was at times difficult as members serve as liaisons for other committees on campus
- b) The committee feels that an important standing charge for consideration from the senate would be the review of the Referral Guide for Student Concerns with input from both faculty and students. This standing charge could be assessed yearly, i.e., each spring, based on student concerns and new guidelines drafted and disseminated to the campus community; Fry also asked for guidance from the Senate that if yearly review of the document is added to the standing charge, how might the committee best balance existing charges with new charges, given members' participation in other *ad hoc* committees.
- c) Some concerns raised amongst committee members was that the balance of work is disproportionate due to their role as liaison on other campus committees that other members are not involved with. The overall sentiment is that this committee is atypical given the role on other committees and student conduct, and that members are always "on call" based on need. As such some members feel that because the workload is not that of a typical committee, they are not prepared to participate fully in the committee work.
- d) Discussion was had on how well the committee was operating with the number of assigned faculty, i.e, 5. Could the committee function with less, more or the same? Fry seems to think that the committee could be smaller, but if so, then the members must be active and focused on the committee, and given that it is hard to predict when

other ad hoc and search committees will be taking place, the optimal number of faculty on the committee is hard to determine.

- e) Question arose as to how the draft document created by student member Laneka Viney focused on what students of color wished faculty knew will be used. Fry said that this document will be included as resource for faculty in the student resource guide
- f) Fry also mentioned that this was the first year all committee members received training on student conduct
- g) M/S/P to receive the report

6. Review of motion to revise the Faculty Bylaws (regarding organization changes)

Discussion of changing Bylaws to reflect new title change of Dean to Provost.

The senate had in informal discussion regarding changing the language in the Bylaws of Dean to Provost to reflect the change in title of Kris Bartenen's position

Main question that arose is whether there is a way to resolve how new faculty would view different positions of "Dean" and "Provost" without access to the Bylaws given that currently they are one in the same individual? Where would this information be made available for an outside person coming to the University? What about in the event of a new Provost hire?

Suggestions for clarifying the title of Provost and the role of Provost is to send email to existing and new faculty, add an * to note that the 2 titles mean the same, and update the search results on the University website to reflect the change in title and role.

Beardsley asked how what is happening currently any different than what happened 25 years ago when the Academic Vice President and Dean were used interchangeably? Both titles were reflected as one in the same and currently, the Dean is referred as "Academic Vice President"

MacBain asked where is it codified that the Dean is the Academic Vice President and vice versa? This information is in the faculty code and interpretation of the code. The PSC has the ability to interpret the code. Perhaps this is something the PSC could be charged with – interpreting the interpretation of code for verification. Also, consider asking the PSC to assess whether the language of Vice President in the code should be removed to make the language consistent

Beardsley – the Board and administration maintain flexibility without coming to faculty for approval; therefore, this is not something we need to decide or write into code. The interpretation of the title should be based on the status in which the individual(s) is hired and faculty should be able to maintain this flexibility without writing it into the Bylaws

Other changes to Bylaws

Based on the above discussion, the following changes in the Bylaws will be presented for consideration to the full faculty:

- 1) Section 6, F (SLC): the Dean of Students will serve as the ex-officio representative of the Dean of the University
- 2) Section 6, H (CoD): the Chief Diversity Officer will serve as the ex-officio representative of the Dean of the University
- 3) Section 6, J (IEC): removing one student representative

Consideration of removing one student representative from IEC

Discussion to change number of faculty from 7 to 5 – this is still being discussed by the IEC. The odd number of faculty is necessary for breaking ties.

Kukreja suggests that senate consider keeping the number of faculty as is given the growing presence of international programs in our curriculum – by maintaining faculty a “stronger” voice in the committee could help expand academic perspective of the program.

These proposed changes will be presented for first reading at the April 4 faculty meeting

7. Review of motion to revise the Faculty Code (regarding promotion to the rank of professor) (See Appendix B)

The senate had an informal discussion about how best to move forward with the revision of language on promotion to full professor. This revision stemmed from focus group discussions from Fall 2017 and survey data from the Office of Institutional Research. The discussion focused on how best to introduce the revised language to the full faculty. Would the motion be to bring forward the revision and implementation of the revision simultaneously or as individual pieces? This question is best answered by determining whether the intent is to change the code at the next faculty meeting and the answer was not at this time.

If the language in the code is revised and passed, how is the new language implemented? Given that once the code is changed it becomes contractual, how will faculty be assessed during consideration for promotion to full? Further, when an old code is amended, the old code ceases to “exist”; therefore, what documents will be used to determine promotion to full? Would the existing faculty fall under the guidelines of the existing code for how “distinguished service” is defined? Given these ambiguities and that departments are now undergoing 8-year cycle of department review guideline updates, departments would need to retain current and immediately prior standards.

This topic has been placed on the agenda for the upcoming faculty meeting for consideration

8. Discussion of report regarding non-tenure line faculty members at Puget Sound (See Appendix C)

The senate had an informal discussion about the role of non-tenure line faculty based on 3 conversations senate execs had with non-tenure faculty in Spring 2017. The main themes that emerged were: 1) job security and 2) investment in the individual

One area of concern was the 6-year rule – is this a federal standard or Puget Sound-specific? What is the rule and how should this be imposed. This is not a federal mandate; it is a “best practices” for not keeping faculty on a visiting position for more than 6 years unless position is defined as such per AAUP guidelines.

There is a strong consensus that the 6-year rule needs to be remedied and/or clarified. Martin Jackson has been working on this issue and is determining how to “clean up” the visiting position. Departments interpreting the 6-year rule have lost many good faculty due to the vagueness of the standards. Each department, as well as the chair, seems to have differing definitions of the 6-year rule and how it is implemented under their direction. There must be more consistency with this across campus moving forward. In addition, given that some faculty are renewed annually the opportunities to serve on committees and/or contribute to faculty governance do not exist. Some faculty expressed a need to provide opportunities for professional growth.

Another area of concern is how service is defined for non-tenure line faculty. At present, service is defined by each department and the expectations are varied. How are these individuals supported? Mentoring and support also varies widely by department.

Suzanne Warren from English suggested that non-tenure line faculty have greater presence in the consideration of how hiring/retention process is carried out so that there is more transparency.

Where does the Senate go with the report? Should this be disseminated to the campus community at large? Lotus Perry from Asian studies feels this is a good start for engagement and conversation about non-tenure line faculty and their role/contribution to the University.

One of the areas being discussed in the strategic plan is this topic and further conversation will ensue.

9. Other Business

Fox-Dobbs revisited the work of LMIS on the draft document of best practices for managing faculty data. General discussion points centered on what to do with the vast amount of information generated by the committee on the various areas of sensitive data and how best to encrypt, store, etc. It is the sentiment of the committee that many of us do not pay enough attention on what we are doing with the large amount of sensitive material we have, both hard and digital. Committee members used their own email accounts to determine how best to implement practice of sensitive material.

The senate feels that the committee should make recommendations based on their expert opinion for consideration of next year's senate.

How should this information be communicated to the faculty? Via facultycoms? Pamphlet? Email? This will be communicated back to the committee

10. Meeting adjourned at 1:17 pm

Minutes prepared by Jung Kim

Respectfully submitted,
Pierre Ly
Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Appendix A: Student Life Committee End of Year Report 2017-18

The committee met on roughly a monthly basis throughout the year. The committee's members were:

Mike Beneviste, faculty
Poppy Fry, faculty, chair
Jennifer Hastings, faculty (fall)
Alan Krause, faculty (spring)
Collin Noble, student
Maria Sampen, faculty
Mike Valentine, faculty
Lenaka Viney, student

Kris Bartenen was a member of the committee ex-officio, Eli Gandour-Rood was the staff representative, and Sam Liao attended as a liaison from the Committee on Diversity.

The Faculty Senate liaison was Kristin Johnson.

The committee continues to work out how it best can carry out its charges and provide a meaningful location for faculty service. This year the committee met more frequently than in the previous year, and in coming meetings the committee will be assessing the usefulness of that model.

At the beginning of the year, the committee identified a particular area of concern: faculty members' need for complete information about how to best connect their students with resources around life issues. The committee has spent much of the year soliciting feedback from faculty and students on how best to facilitate the communication of such information. This has resulted in the more prominent way in which the Referral Guide for Student Concerns has been situated on the university website and in an email reminding faculty of its existence. The committee is working to update and flesh out the referral guide to ensure that it addresses all the areas expressed as concerns. The committee has also concluded that review of the referral guide should be one of its standing charges. The committee requests that the Faculty Senate either create a new charge asking the SLC to review and offer feedback upon the Referral Guide for Student Concerns, or amend the standing charge regarding the review of information to specifically reference the Referral Guide for Student Concerns.

The committee discussed the potential need to remind faculty and students of faculty members' responsibilities as responsible employees with regard to the reporting of sexual misconduct, and it remains undecided on whether or not this is a useful location for SLC work.

The committee continues to act as a pool of potential faculty (and students) for student-life-relevant ad-hoc committees. Mike Valentine served as the SLC representative on the newly-formed committee working on changes to the Student Integrity Code. Poppy Fry continued as the SLC representative on the Sexual and Gender Violence Committee. Collin Noble served as the SLC representative on the Union Board.

The committee also continues to act as a pool of potential faculty for student conduct hearings. All faculty on the committee were trained in this capacity, and they served on approximately 8 hearing boards of various types.

The committee fulfilled its charge to conduct reviews of and make recommendations on policies related to student life. The SLC received a presentation from Marta Cady and Greg Shipman on the new orientation plan, as well as a presentation from Sarah Comstock on the revision of the Student Integrity Code. In both cases, the committee engaged in dialogue with the presenters and offered feedback.

The SLC has two meetings remaining in the 2017-18 academic year. In the first meeting, the committee's recommendations regarding the Referral Guide for Student Concerns will be finalized. In the second, the committee will revisit its meeting schedule and discuss how this year's organization could be improved upon so as to render the SLC as useful as possible both to its members and to the university.

Appendix B: 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. Those reports are attached here for your consideration.

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 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 Bylaws 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. (So, if passed in AY 2017-18, tenure line faculty who join the faculty in AY 2018-19 will be subject to the revised language.)

PART II. PROPOSED LANGUAGE FOR REVISION TO THE FACULTY CODE (at III.3.e)

“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 achievement. 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 C: Report from meetings with non-tenure line faculty

Prepared by Alisa Kessel

7 February 2018

In May 2017, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (Kessel, Lanctot, Ly) hosted three conversations with non-tenure line faculty at the university. An invitation to participate was extended to all instructional staff who are not on the tenure line, and we engaged in conversation with faculty colleagues from a range of departments and positions (full- and part-time VAPs, long-time instructors, clinical instructors, and part-time faculty affiliates, such as debate coaches). About twenty colleagues participated in the conversations.

The purpose of the meetings was to identify the concerns of non-tenure line faculty, particular as they might differ from concerns of tenured or tenure-line faculty and to consider whether there were areas for improvement. We oriented the conversations around three questions, which were sent to participants in advance:

- What kind of support do you wish you had from other faculty (in your department and elsewhere on campus)?
- Regarding faculty governance: what are the barriers to your participation faculty governance—or what are the things that make it a priority for you?
- What else do we need to know about the experience of non-tenure line faculty on campus?

Based on our conversations, four themes emerged:

- concerns about job security and ways that Puget Sound can alleviate some anxiety; for those who are visiting members of the faculty, this concern cannot be overstated
- a sense of institutional disinterest in investment in the non-tenure line faculty member who, nevertheless, feel expected to invest in the place (and its people)
- a desire for more (and more substantive) acknowledgement of the importance of the work of non-tenure line faculty and integration of these colleagues into the life of the college
- wide variance across departments in terms of expectations and support for non-tenure line colleagues

Community membership:

- desire to be supported as an essential part of the community in a way that ensures that the burdens of community membership are not too great

Job security

- attendees expressed a frustration with lack of clarity regarding future prospects (and even a sense, at times, of mixed signals); the distribution of contracts in May was a special source of stress for visiting colleagues
- 6-year rule: permanent instructors and VAPs alike question the usefulness of this rule, especially if the university replaces one “6 year visitor” with another who is asked to do similar work (with less investment in and commitment to the university)

Investment in the person

- evaluation:
 - permanent instructors feel burdened by the requirement to complete files every 3 years, which means that they require student evaluations almost every term
 - visiting instructors' evaluation and feedback varies widely by department (many of the participants in our focus groups noted that they had almost no observation or mentoring)

- integration into campus life:
 - some recommended a social event for VAPs in the fall (though they also noted that they appreciated being included in new faculty orientation)
 - there is wide variance among departments in how they orient and support visiting faculty
 - inclusion of all adjuncts on facultycoms (especially those who are being asked to recruit and represent the university beyond the campus; it helps to stay in the loop about new developments or issues)
- sabbatical eligibility or course release eligibility for permanent instructors would afford them an opportunity to undertake professional development

Acknowledgement of commitment

- visiting colleagues in particular would like the opportunity to participate in the life of the instructional staff (such as inclusion on facultycoms)
- unclear (and, at times, perhaps unreasonable) expectations about participation in departmental governance and faculty service (it is especially difficult—if not downright inappropriate—for those who are on the job market to be expected to perform service for departments or the university)
- some colleagues reported that visitors and instructors are not well-regarded (or are treated less well) by tenure line faculty (one even observed “two tiers” at the university)

Some possible changes, proposed by the attendees:

- 1) Clarification of Faculty Code language regarding role and expectations and review for clinical instructors
- 2) Reconsideration of the “six-year rule” in order to offer more secure employment while simultaneously protecting tenure.
- 3) Contracts: When possible, provide a verbal guarantee of reappointment (contracts are distributed for all faculty in May, but notification can come earlier to relieve the worries of colleagues seeking reappointment)
- 4) Clarification of departmental obligations to visiting instructors, especially with respect to:
 - a. mentoring
 - b. observation and constructive feedback
 - c. service expectations (especially for the department)
- 5) Creation of new instructor positions (or a core of instructional staff) that are not tenure line, but are permanent, subject to meeting review criteria