

Minutes for the April 8 2019 Faculty Senate Meeting

Senators Present: Heather Bailey, Uchenna Baker, Kris Bartanen, Bill Beardsley, Gwynne Brown, Sara Freeman, Megan Gessel, Alison Tracy Hale, Kelly Johnson, Kristin Johnson, Jung Kim, Mushawn Knowles, Tiffany MacBain, Andrew Monaco, Bryan Thines, Heather White, Peter Wimberger

Guests: Roger Allen, Amy Fisher, John Hanson, David Latimer, Garrett Milam, Justin Tiehen, Mike Valentine, Nila Wiese

I. Chair Freeman called the meeting to order at 12:pm

II. Announcements: Jacobsen recital 'Women in Music' is 7:30pm Friday

III. M/S/P minutes from March 25, 2019

The possibility of including an Addendum to the March 11th minutes was discussed, as guest Julie Nelson Christoph was not included in the list of attendees nor were the minutes circulated to her for review prior to approval at the March 25th meeting. Christoph asked that a document produced by Martin Jackson regarding a plan for short term faculty be attached to those minutes. Given we cannot change approved and posted minutes, we are attaching the document here as **Appendix A**.

- Senators also expressed a desire to clarify the Senate's response to Christoph's presentation, although Beardsley pointed out we didn't give a formal response (we asked questions but made no motion). It seems changes are quite far down the road, involving bylaws for example, but Senate didn't mean to give the impression the issue shouldn't be worked on more. Freeman noted the question is whether we would like to take action this year or form an ad-hoc committee or task force later. Senators agreed that while we received the information and regard it as useful, we will not be forming a committee until August. We do want to consider potential actions both from the Provost and Dean's office and the faculty. Senators agreed that we are not trying to stop the Dean's initiative.

- The Provost clarified (with respect to discussions regarding the Common Hour at the previous meeting) that the language holds that 'when possible courses in that slot should be taught by non-voting faculty members' and noted that some contingent faculty (i.e., full-time visiting faculty) are also voting members.

IV. Updates from ASUPS or Staff Senate: ASUPS President Knowles noted that ASUPS is going to be reviewing applications and scheduling interviews for ASUPS executive positions, and may be extending the deadline. Please send names, especially of students interested in Business and Technology, as applications tend to be scarce for these positions. Staff

Representative Bailey announced that the Rosa Beth Gibson Book scholarship raffle is on and nominations for the Excellence in Action award are open.

V. Reports from Standing Committees and CTF: Kim reported that the CTF is shifting focus to Pathways models next, including their content and integration & how courses and scaffolding are developed. The CTF is now leaning toward some hybrid model of models A&B (as presented at the March 6 faculty meeting), and implementation via phases with the goal of full-fledged pathways in place 2-3 years down the road. The idea for the Fall 2020 class is to roll out the new curriculum in small doses. A hybrid model would be based on ½ of core being integrated into pathways, with, for example, 3 approaches to knowing in a Pathway. Freeman noted this plan arises from a proposal by Elise Richman (available in the google drive) that as faculty design pathways some of the core areas be addressed in the pathway. The assumption is that we can then remove connections because the pathway becomes the Connection. The goal is to change things via a natural process without being too disruptive. Johnson asked about when workload would be addressed, and Freeman replied that we must figure out scaffolding first before turning to workload issues over the summer and next year, and as faculty agree to models.

VI. Report from the Faculty Salary Committee: Hanson reminded Senators that the FSC is not a senate committee, but that it is part of their business is to communicate with faculty. The FSC has been trying to move faculty salaries to median of a newly chosen peer group (provided in the FSC's BTF report – see **Appendix B**). Between 2016/2017 and 2017/2018 this constituted designed increases in especially junior faculty salaries and a closer approach to the median, but there is still a ways to go. The FSC's request to the BTF moved forward to the Board of Trustees at the February meeting and was approved. Fisher shared the results of a survey regarding pay for overload and summer work completed by Ellen Peters, and noted that based on that survey our practices are in line more or less with our peers. However, the FSC requested that the PSC looks into situations in which faculty might be explicitly or implicitly required to teach overloads, since these added teaching responsibilities might have negative impacts on a faculty member's ability to satisfy criteria necessary for advancement or tenure. White asked about current practices with respect to overloads, and the FSC replied that overloads are paid the adjunct rate, which is on point with our peers. Freeman noted the PSC will be charged next year to address overload issues. Tiehen noted that Business, Comp Sci and Economics faculty receive \$7,000 more as assistant professors 1-6, associate professors receive \$5,000 at a decreasing scale; and full professors in these departments are on an equal scale with their colleagues in other departments and programs. The reasoning behind having this different scale (in place since 2012) has to do with consistent problems recruiting and retaining faculty in those fields. Given that while salaries in general have increased but these differentials have not, the Provost proposed a slight increase to the differentials to address retention and recruitment problems and the FSC approved those increases. FSC members noted that the conversation regarding those increases seemed rushed given they occurred in the middle of searches-in-progress, and noted that a slower conversation is warranted. Conversation should take place if and when additional or new departments/programs are folded

into this system. Milam added that (from the perspective of a department (Economics) using these differential scales), University of Arkansas data shows from a 2017/2018 survey that if you take our adjusted salary scale with the differential increase, we are still 20% lower than the average salary for undergrad and master's degree granting (non-R1) institutions in these fields. Discussion concluded with a note that the Faculty Compensation Document has a philosophy and recommendations that guide the FSC's decisions. Conversation about the above issues will continue in future.

Senate received the FSC's Report.

VII. (Interim) Report from the University Enrichment Committee. Allen reminded senators of the committee's standing charges which constitute most of the UEC's work. The three additional charges included evaluating process for professional school research award submissions, reviewing committee documents to ensure consistency between evaluation rubrics and submission guidelines, and consider establishing fall information sessions for faculty openly reviewing the professional development opportunities available and the procedures and expectations for application. Allen noted that only 1 application came in for faculty release unit of 5 potential units, so that is a resource that is not fully tapped. Noted Doug Sackman presented this year's Regester lecture, which the UEC sponsors. Recommended that given the UEC is required by a memorandum of understanding to give the Dirk Andrew Phibbs Research Award this should be a standing charge. Congratulations were offered to Chair Sara Freeman who is this year's Dirk Andrew Phibbs Research Award winner! Noted that the UEC needs to take on the task of creating a list of previous award recipients. And noted that the UEC provides not just an awarding role but a pedagogical in helping students and faculty improve their proposals, including, for example providing rubrics for protocols for students. Look for details (including on all of the above) when the UEC submits its final report to be attached to the May 3rd minutes.

VIII. (Interim) Report of the Student Life Committee. The SLC evaluated how easy it was for students to navigate student resources, in cooperation with the Dean of Students Office and Dr. Baker. The DSO is now developing a strategic plan and SLC will be providing feedback on that. SLC populates, as liaisons, various committees, but this year that work did not seem to continue, and the members wondered where those requests traditionally came from, as the process doesn't seem to be systematized. Clarifying this process would be helpful for next year's work. Noted that the SLC needs to reach out to ASUPS more given their standing charges. Wimberger noted that one of the justifications for keeping the number of SLC higher was due to the requests coming in to serve on committees. Baker noted that in the case of conduct, requests will be coming in, but did not know where the other requests tended to come from. Bartanen noted that historically there weren't enough faculty to populate all the committees for which liaisons were needed, so Senate decided that the SLC would be the place for that work. Baker noted that in recent position transitions the connection might have been lost but the lack of requests doesn't mean the need is not still there. Kelly Johnson noted that the

Students Ideas and Concerns Committee would benefit from a faculty liaison. Valentine noted that the SLC needs a more formal procedure to have such requests come in.

IX. (Interim) Report of the Library, Media, Information Services Committee. Hannaford was chair in Fall and Latimer took it over in Spring. Reviewed the report – noting that the final draft of the Best Practices Document will be included in the final report. Reviewed the case studies LMIS used to examine how decisions are made. Wimberger asked, in the context of a point about transparency, whether the move to laptops had ever been reviewed by LMIS, and Latimer noted not to his knowledge. Knowles asked for more context for the Best Practices document and Latimer provided some background regarding concern whether faculty are being mindful of sensitive information. Bartanen noted the document could be useful to ASUPS as well, i.e. with respect to nominations, etc. Latimer agreed with Freeman that the issue of Elsevier should be on LMIS' agenda. Wimberger noted a need to encourage TS to develop a more collaborative relationship with faculty, as he has heard from various faculty that interactions are not always positive; one often receives the sense Tech Services knows what to do and they are going to do it their way. Latimer noted that the library liaison system means personal relationships are established, and asked whether that model could be applied to TS.

M/S/P adjourned 1:18pm

Submitted Respectfully,

Kristin Johnson

APPENDIX A

Term faculty positions proposal
Martin Jackson for Assoc. Deans' Office November 2018

A proposal for term faculty positions

Background

For several decades, delivering a sufficient and satisfactory class schedule has been achieved with non-tenure-line, full-time faculty positions supplementing tenure-line positions. The primary types of non-tenure-line positions have been the Instructor rank, clinical positions in the graduate programs, and visiting positions. Tenure-line, Instructor, and clinical positions are often referred to as “continuing positions” with the presumption that the positions will continue indefinitely (subject to satisfactory evaluations and review of curricular needs). In the mid-1990s, a strategic decision was made to make no further appointments at the ongoing Instructor rank. As Instructor lines became open through attrition, several were converted to tenure-line positions; in more recent years, in order to protect the long-term salary budget, three vacant Instructor positions were converted to two tenure-line positions. The number of Instructor positions has decreased from a high of about 40 to the current level of 12.

Visiting positions are approved for a variety of reasons including as sabbatical replacements and to fill needs not met with continuing positions. In principle, each visiting position is in place to meet a short-term need and is thus temporary. For many years, a policy has been in place to the effect that an individual cannot be in a visiting faculty position for more than six years. This policy has been an oral tradition with no written version in place so a precise statement does not exist. As a consequence, the policy has ambiguities and has been understood differently in different times and places. In particular, there is ambiguity for situations in which an individual has non-consecutive appointments as a visiting faculty member (with gaps filled by either no faculty position or part-time appointments). In some parts of campus, a “clock reset” notion was held with the idea that a gap of a semester or more “reset the six-year clock,” allowing an individual who has already completed six-years of visiting appointments to return to begin a new series of visiting appointments. In other parts of campus, the “six-year” policy was taken as absolute with no notion of a “clock reset.”

One consequence of the move to convert Instructor positions to tenure-line positions has been use of visiting positions in some areas to address persistent needs beyond leave replacements, resulting in more departments and individuals impacted by the six-year policy. A significant number of departments have asked for either a change in the six-year policy or a new type of faculty position. In response to these questions and concerns, options that could be considered include:

1. Formalize the “six-year rule” in a written policy that clarifies questions such as
 - How does part-time teaching count toward the six years?
 - Is there a “clock reset” option? If so, under what circumstances?
2. Retract the “six-year rule” and have visiting positions with reappointment allowed indefinitely. In this case, we might want a more structured evaluation process for any series of appointments that continues more than a year or two.
3. Introduce some type of non-tenure-line *term position* that might have one or more of the following characteristics:
 - A position could be approved for a fixed term based on consideration of need.
 - At the end of a term, a position could be renewed after review of need.
 - If a position is renewed, an individual already in the position could be reappointed (with an indefinite number of reappointments allowed if the position continues to be renewed).

The current proposal is for a new category of non-tenure-line faculty position that would provide policies and procedures with potential to allow an individual to be reappointed beyond six years contingent upon continued need and satisfactory performance evaluations. The Faculty Code allows for the creation of such a new type of faculty position through Section I.B which states “Non-tenure-line faculty members are those appointed as instructor, adjunct faculty, visiting faculty, or other positions that might be created. Non-tenure-line faculty are appointed on a contract basis. Such contractual relations may continue indefinitely but shall not lead to tenure.” The category of *clinical positions* seems to be an existing category that falls under this provision.

Basic nature of proposed positions

The main purpose of the new position type proposed here is to fill longer-term instructional needs not relating primarily to leave replacement. The phrase *term positions* will be used to distinguish from *visiting positions*. Visiting positions will continue to be used to address short-term needs such as leave replacements.

The main characteristics of the proposed term positions include:

- Full-time at 5 to 6 units (depending on needs)
- Responsibilities can include teaching, advising, and service to the department
- Fixed term position of up to five years based on determination of need by department and associate dean with final approval by the Provost
- Two levels:[1]

- Term Instructor (TIN): primarily teach lower-division courses; masters level degree typically required; terminal degree not required
- Term Assistant Professor (TAP): teach mix of lower-division and upper-division courses; terminal degree required
- Potential for renewal of a position for a new term based on request, review, and approval
- Potential for reappointment of an individual to a renewed term (assuming satisfactory evaluations under the process described below)

Position request and approval

The request process for a new term position or renewal of a current term position will include these steps:

- Department sends a written request to the relevant associate dean. The request should include rationale based on analysis of recent enrollment data and projection for enrollments in relevant courses through the requested term. (Tentative timeline: October of the academic year prior to anticipated start of new or renewed term)
- The associate dean reviews request and consults with department as needed before forwarding a recommendation to Academic Vice-President. (Tentative timeline: December of academic year prior to anticipated start)
- The Academic Vice-President reviews request for approval. (Tentative timeline: January of academic year prior to anticipated start)

Filling a term position

If a search is needed to fill a new or renewed term position, search and appointment processes will follow the processes for visiting faculty positions in the Faculty Recruitment Guidelines. The initial appointment will include language that continuation of the appointment beyond the first year is contingent upon a satisfactory evaluation.

If a request for a renewed term includes a recommendation for reappointment of the incumbent, an evaluation must be completed either in the academic year prior to the year of the request or in fall of the request year.

Note that some provisions should be made for cases in which a term faculty member departs before the end of an approved term.

Evaluation

Evaluation of term faculty members will be based upon the quality of performance in the following areas, listed in order of importance:

- Teaching
- Professional currency: Term faculty members are expected to remain current in the relevant parts of the discipline and to keep abreast of those developments in the discipline which bear upon their teaching duties.
- Advising students (if assigned as a responsibility)
- Participation in departmental service

The standards to be employed in assessing professional performance within these areas will be those used for all other evaluations in the department.[2]

A term faculty member in an initial appointment will be evaluated by the head officer of the relevant department, school, or program at the end of the first year. The basis for the evaluation will be conversations between the term faculty member and head officer, class session visits by the head officer, and instructor/course evaluations. The head officer can solicit input from faculty colleagues in the department, school, or program. The head officer will write a report and provide copies to the individual being evaluated and to the Provost.

Evaluations after the second year will follow the process described in Chapter III Section 5 (Evaluation by Head Officer and Dean) of the Faculty Code.[3] Reappointment to a renewed term position is contingent upon a satisfactory evaluation using that process that is completed during the term prior to the proposed reappointment.

Salary

Salary for term faculty members will be based on the Instructor and Assistant ranks of the faculty salary scale. Initial placement on the scale will be determined by the usual practice of granting credit for prior experience with one step for each year of full-time teaching at the college level after earning the relevant required degree and one step for every two years of full-time post-doctoral fellowship experience. After the initial year, a term faculty member will advance in step each year through the seventh step in the relevant rank.

Relation to Faculty Code and Faculty Bylaws

Aspects of the Faculty Code that might require interpretation with respect the proposed term positions include:

- Section II.4 on Reappointment which states “The provisions of this section also apply to faculty members who are full-time instructors except those holding appointments as visiting faculty.” The applicability of this section’s terms to the proposed term positions should perhaps be examined. (The same is true of applicability to the existing category of clinical positions.)

- Interpretation of Chapter III, Section 4 - The Role of “Colleagues” in the Evaluation Process. (PSC minutes 28 March 2012): This interpretation that “adjunct and visiting faculty are not ‘colleagues’ with respect to evaluation” is based on the observation “There is no formal evaluation of adjuncts and visiting faculty by other colleagues in the department. Adjuncts and visiting faculty are evaluated by the department chair.” The relevance of this interpretation to the proposed term positions should be examined in light of the evaluation process proposed above.

With respect to the Faculty Bylaws, the follow aspects might require attention:

- Article II Section 1 defines membership as consisting of those in specific administrative positions and “and members of the instructional staff classified as follows: Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, Instructor, and full-time visiting faculty”. The status of the proposed term positions in relation to Faculty membership could be made explicit through an interpretation by the Faculty Senate or amendment considered by the full faculty.
- Section IV.6.A.a states “Eligible to be elected to the Senate are full-time members of the non-retired instructional staff classified as follows: Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, and Instructor.” The question of whether or not those in the proposed term positions should be eligible for election to the Senate should perhaps be given attention.

[1] Alternate language might be Lecturer and Senior Lecturer. One advantage of using Term Instructor and Term Assistant Professor is a more obvious connection to the faculty salary scale. See Salary below.
[2] Language here is adopted from the Faculty Code interpretation regarding evaluation of instructors.
[3] A potential variation would be to allow the Dean to delegate the responsibilities in III.5.d to an associate dean.

APPENDIX B: Faculty Salary Committee Presentation to Senate

The Faculty Salary Committee (FSC) presented its request to the Budget Task Force on Wednesday, November 28, 2018. The document, posted on Soundnet, in a folder "1 Faculty Salary Reports" provides information about the FSC's thinking and analysis that led to its request on behalf of the faculty. To learn more, please visit:

<https://soundnet.pugetsound.edu/sites/Team/WorkTeams/Dean/SitePages/Home.aspx>.

Colleagues also requested last year that we look into the issue of overload and summer pay. Ellen Peters in Institutional Research kindly asked our peer institutions to anonymously provide us with information about their overload and summer compensation practices to provide us with a point of comparison.

Nineteen institutions replied to this request. Of those 19 institutions: 17 confirmed that their faculty occasionally teach overloads; 2 replied that faculty are never asked to teach more than their regular course assignment.

Of the 17 institutions in which faculty occasionally teach overloads: 13 institutions provide financial compensation, 4 institutions bank faculty overload work towards a future course release and/or count it towards sabbatical so that the person becomes eligible for sabbatical sooner (rather than later).

On teaching summer sessions, of the 19 institutions queried: 15 reported that they regularly offer summer courses. Out of those 15: 4 reported that they offer only a few courses in specialized fields, such as social work, nursing, etc.). In terms of pay, 10 offer a flat rate (adjunct rate), 2 provide compensation according to the number of students enrolled in the course (fewer students less pay), and 3 offer slight variations in compensation according to rank and field.

In short, we concluded that our compensation practices are more or less in line with that of our peers. We did, however, want to recommend that the Professional Standards Committee look into whether faculty are required to teach overloads in certain fields or if it is voluntary. If it is required, this may affect especially junior colleagues' ability to meet the professional development and service criteria for tenure and promotion.