

## **Minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting, February 9, 2009. McCormick Room, Library, UPS**

**Present:** Douglas Cannon (Chair), Hans Ostrom (Scribe of the Day), William Haltom, Amy Ryken, Kris Bartanen (Academic V.P.), Richard Anderson-Connolly, Leslie Saucedo, Seth Weinberger (guest, Chair of Academic Standards Committee), Brad Tomhave (guest, Registrar), Sarah Moore (guest, Associate Dean) , Jada Pelger (Staff Senate), Terry Beck, Yusuf Word (ASUPS President), Steve Neshyba, Jack Roundy (guest, Director of Academic Advising), Ross Heyman (ASUPS Vice President), Sue Hannaford, Peter Wimberger (guest, Biology Department), Mike Segawa (Dean of Students), Priti Joshi (guest, English Department).

Cannon called the meeting to order, introduced guests, and mentioned corrections to the minutes from the previous meeting. Ryken noted additional corrections to the minutes.

**M/S/P to approve the minutes (*as corrected by Cannon and Ryken*) from the previous meeting.**

### Special Orders

Anderson-Connolly noted that UPS is in a “deficit” situation with regard to faculty tuition-remission/exchange (for dependent children) with regard to Willamette University.

### Committee Liaisons

No reports.

### Tuition Exchange and Remission

Bartanen distributed a photocopy from the Human Resources’ document, “Education Benefits for Dependent Children.” (**The document is available from HR. It is also appended to the minutes, although some information in the far right-hand column may not fit in this format. Colleagues are encouraged to consult a copy from Human Resources.**) She noted that there is a 30-semester “cap” in each of the five Northwest Colleges that, in effect, limits the number of dependent children of faculty that can be admitted (with tuition exchange) at each campus. She noted some examples of colleges whose faculty cannot receive tuition-exchange for children at certain colleges at the moment. For example, dependent children of faculty from Lewis and Clark are currently not able to get the tuition exchange at two other colleges. She encouraged faculty members to begin to look at Puget Sound’s tuition-remission/exchange status with each college early on in the college-admission process, when their children are sophomores or juniors in high school. At the moment, only Willamette University seems to be posing a problem with regard to the tuition-exchange, she noted.

Neshyba inquired about the impact of UPS’s size with regard to tuition- remission-status, and Bartanen noted that it probably works to UPS’s benefit.

### **Elimination of Pass/Fail Grading Option**

Cannon noted that the Academic Standards Committee's (ASC) minutes speak to the proposed elimination of the P/F option, and he reviewed the current policy from the *Logger*.

He wondered whether professor may now prevent students from taking courses on a P/F basis. Answer: no.

Cannon reviewed the *By Laws* concerning how standing committees' recommendation may or may not go into effect, with respect to the Senate and the full faculty. He reviewed the Senate's options with regard to the P/F recommendation.

Weinberger presented the committee's rationale for the recommendation and noted that the committee had not wanted to sneak anything by the Senate and indeed desired further discussion on the topic.

#### Reasons for action

P/F fits with a liberal-arts education's emphasis on exploring a variety of subjects. However, one professor on ASC noted that introductory creative-writing classes seem to have a disproportionate number of P/F students, some of whom occasionally create undue difficulties. A similar phenomenon occurs with some art classes and one business class. He provided statistics, which suggested that with regard to some of the courses mentioned, as many as 3 out of 20 students may be taking a given class P/F.

If freshmen take introductory courses on a P/F basis, the course cannot count for a major the student may later declare. Thus, taking the course on a P/F basis creates a kind of trap.

If students take an excess number of classes in the major P/F, rigor may be eroded.

Some students take courses P/F in error (unwittingly violating university or departmental guidelines), and this circumstance affects their ability to graduate.

Law schools tend not to regard P/F courses from the undergraduate transcript highly.

Compared with Lewis and Clark and Reed and other colleges, Puget Sound has the more lenient policy with regard to P/F. All schools analyzed required professors' permission to take courses P/F, for example.

Ostrom echoed the concern expressed in #1 and noted that in most introductory creative-writing classes, about 10 per cent of the students (or 2 out of 20) probably take the course P/F and, in some cases, may not come into the course with enough seriousness of purpose, in spite of what professors and syllabi clearly state. The circumstance sometimes creates undue tension between

the students' and the courses' expectations throughout the term; the student regrets having taken the course, and the professor may regret the student's having taken the course, too.

Haltom thanked Weinberger for providing a rationale that did not appear to be included in the ASC minutes. He also observed that data about students' views of the P/F are valuable. In Fall of 2008, 51 students out of about 2500 total students took classes P/F. Haltom called, in general, for the gathering of more information about the P/F option before the Senate or the faculty were to consider eliminating the option.

Neshyba asked how "permission of instructor" worked at other colleges, and Weinberger said students must secure the professor's permission to take a course P/F before registering for the course.

Beck suggested that the new policy would move Puget Sound from the *most* lenient to the *least* lenient among peers, and he said he is not a fan of passing the elimination of the P/F option on to the faculty because the faculty meetings are not a good place to craft specific language for such policies.

Anderson-Connolly advocated for a permission-of-instructor system, as opposed to eliminating the P/F option. He said the permission-option seemed easy to administer and workable. He suggested sending the P/F issue back to the ASC for reconsideration, particularly with this option in mind.

Cannon noted that, in the *By Laws*, the Senate is described as the executive committee of the Senate and therefore may act for the faculty with regard to committees' decisions and crafting language for the approval of the faculty.

Joshi acknowledged Haltom's point about there being only 51 students out of 2500 taking courses P/F, but she said that even one student in a class who requires excessive attention of the professor is a waste of the professor's energy and talent.

Weinberger said the committee discussed the permission-option but indicated the committee noted that students may be adversely affected by it. He said the committee wanted to get the faculty's reaction to this issue and others, however.

Joshi said the permission-of-instructor option may place undue stress on untenured faculty when it comes to deciding whether to allow a student to take a course P/F.

Haltom asked Weinberger about Professor Breitenbach's alleged objection to P/F, namely that it may result in grade-inflation. Weinberger noted that grade-inflation was probably not a pressing concern with regard to the P/F question, in his opinion.

Haltom agreed, noting that, owing to a P/F option, the worst-case scenario would be a rise from a 3.06 GPA to a 3.1 GPA; therefore, he argued, the effect on grade-inflation of the P/F would be negligible, at best.

Weinberger agreed with Haltom on the statistical point but also agreed with Joshi on the individual-case point.

Haltom asked Weinberger whether the ASC's most important purpose might be achieved by a general faculty-discussion but *not* a meeting at which policy were written. Weinberger thought this to be a good idea, as did Beck.

Word suggested that the Senate take into account students' actual knowledge of the P/F option. He suspects students in general don't know about the P/F option. He said he thinks most students do not abuse the option.

Heyman observed that the P/F option might reduce the stress of taking a class outside of a student's comfort-zone. He values the language in the policy that refers to the exploration of new subjects. He favors the permission-of-instructor option.

Anderson-Connolly supported Word's and Haltom's calls for acquiring more data, specifically concerning students.

Weinberger said the ASC had not pursued the idea of a student-survey.

Moore observed that survey may not be a good instrument for acquiring data in this regard because of how difficult crafting questions correctly might be.

Bartanen noted that the office of institutional research is putting together the annual Spring survey now and might be open to including questions about the P/F option.

Haltom recounted a point of view often expressed by Associate Dean Emeritus John Finney – namely, that students don't use P/F to explore different subjects. Haltom then explored an analogy between P/F and Reading Period, whereby if the university believed that some students were using Reading Period as an interval of relaxation or recreation, not reading, then, according to Finney's logic, we would do away with Reading Period. Anderson-Connolly noted that another option would be to rename Reading Period "Drinking Period." Senators appreciated this suggestion but did not act on it. Haltom asserted that the university should not make policy based on suspicions about why students do what they do.

Bartanen asked Cannon what the next procedural step might be. Cannon: the Senate has 26 class days and thus two meetings to decide what to do. If we do nothing, the policy goes into effect, he noted.

**Haltom moved that the Faculty Senate delay the policy passed by ASC, and that it ask the ASC whether they would be willing to pose questions (about P/F) to be used at an informal faculty meeting. Ostrom seconded.**

Anderson-Connolly asked Weinberger if he were comfortable with the wording of the motion, and Weinberger said that although he thought crafting questions was a good idea, he didn't want to overstep his authority by speaking for the whole committee.

Further discussion ensued. It resulted in a **reworded motion**, duly made and seconded:

**The senate shall delay the (P/F) policy-change and request that the chair of ASC go to the faculty to acquire information about the faculty's perceptions of the P/F option.**

Discussion, as it must, continued.

Beck asked whether we might also gather data about students' perceptions.

Anderson-Connolly asked Word whether the ASUPS could gather information and get it to a faculty –meeting. Word believed this request to be reasonable.

Moore agreed that it would be helpful to know what students would think of the permission-of-instructor option. ASC was reluctant to pursue the option because some professors may treat student differently knowing that the student is taking a course P/F, she observed.

Weinberger mentioned other recommendations that committee had considered: limiting P/F to upper classmen; limiting it to courses outside a student's department; setting a GPA "floor" for eligibility. He would like to get students' opinions of these options, he said.

**The motion passed unanimously.**

Cannon thanked Weinberger and other guests.

### Early Tenure and Promotion

Cannon provided some background on the topic and noted how complicated the topic was because it involved not only tenure and promotion but different standards and an interpretation of the Faculty Code by the Professional Standards Committee (PSC) that appeared to be in limbo.

Haltom distributed copies of three proposed amendments aimed at sorting out these issues. He explained that he wrote them because he was asked to do so (by the Senate) but was not in a position to endorse them.

Cannon noted that the most recent applicable PSC interpretation of the *Code* regarding early promotion and tenure came in 1987. He and Bartanen noted that a more recent PSC interpretation was really "an interpretation of an interpretation," and they noted that the 1987 ruling mentions "tenure" only once but mentions "promotion" multiple times.

Current requirements of early tenure and promotion go back to 1987, Cannon noted. The second interpretation has never gone to the Trustees because the Dean and the PSC believe the substance of the *Code*-language, not just the language itself, should be discussed. Cannon observed that the Senate voted unanimously in Spring 2008 to ask the PSC to craft language which would in effect make the standard for early tenure and promotion the same as that for normal tenure and promotion.

Would Haltom's amendment 3, if passed, eliminate the force of the 1987 interpretation? Cannon asked. Bartanen answered in the negative, for the interpretation concerns promotion, whereas Haltom's amendment addresses tenure.

Joshi noted that the PSC said it stands by the 1987 interpretation.

Cannon suggested that today, the Senate should look at the substance of Haltom's amendments, with an eye toward revision.

Haltom noted that he had included amendment #3 because "shall" was too directive, whereas "may" was appropriately flexible.

Haltom wanted it known that he wrote the amendments as a senator, not as a PSC member.

Joshi asserted that the real problem was not the higher standard (in cases of early tenure and promotion) but the "up or out" policy (with regard to early tenure). If we want to allow for early tenure, then we should strike the "up or out" provision, which gives early candidates' for tenure only one change at earning it. If we do not strike this provision, she argued, then addressing the PSC's interpretations will benefit only those going up for full professor.

Ostrom suggested, melodramatically, that the situation cried out for the creation of an ad-hoc committee to add to and revise Haltom's amendments. Anderson-Connolly asserted the he is not highly motivated to deal with this issue. He said he would prefer that an individual take proposed changes to the faculty.

Haltom noted that the Senate had received the revisions it had asked for but that the Senate need not act on them.

Chastened, Ostrom withdrew his remark about the ad hoc committee.

Joshi urged the Senate to continue to consider the matter.

Cannon agreed and said the intent of Senate in 2008 was to pursue the substance of the Code-language, especially concerning higher standards for early tenure and the "up or out" policy.

Bartanen suggested that a change of language would clarify standards, but she observed that the Trustees probably wouldn't support the elimination of the "up or out" policy regarding early tenure. Going up for tenure more than once would be seen as problematic, she noted.

Joshi asked whether the question of higher standards for early tenure appears in the 1987 interpretation.

Bartanen noted that this was the question she originally took to the PSC to consider. In response to the question of “interpreting an interpretation,” she suggested that ultimately amending the Code may be the most prudent course of action.

Cannon, having produced his infamous clock, suggested that the Senate terminate the discussion for the moment. He said he, the Dean, and the Senate need to clarify several issues related to early tenure and promotion. Suspending the discussion will allow Cannon and Bartanen and Joshi and Haltom (respectively) to confer about the most appropriate next steps. Haltom and Joshi began conferring almost immediately.

**M/S/P to adjourn.**

Respectfully submitted,

Hans Ostrom

Appendix: Education Benefits for Dependent Children

Appendix II: Draft revisions of *Code*-language.

#### EDUCATION BENEFITS FOR DEPENDENT CHILDREN

	<b>Puget Sound Tuition Remission Scholarships</b>	<b>Northwest Independent Colleges Tuition Exchange Scholarships</b>	<b>Tuition Exchange, Inc., Scholarship</b>
<b>Eligibility</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Partial benefit in years one and two of parent's employment</li> <li>Full benefit after two years of parent's employment</li> </ul>	After second anniversary of parent's employment	After second anniversary of parent's employment
<b>Parameters</b>	If dependent meets normal admission standards, scholarship will be awarded	If dependent meets normal admission standards, scholarship may be awarded based on exchange balance between Puget Sound and each individual college <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Subject to a maximum differential of 5 students per year</li> <li>Once overall differential reaches 30 semesters, on "hold" until the differential drops to 15 semesters</li> <li>Preference given based on parent's length of service at Puget Sound</li> </ul>	If dependent meets normal admission standards, scholarship may be awarded based on exchange balance between Puget Sound and all other colleges <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Competitive selection process through colleges' admission offices</li> <li>Colleges with large positive balance receive larger number of new tuition exchange recipients in any given year</li> </ul>
<b>Amount of Tuition Scholarship</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>50% tuition scholarship during first two years of parent's employment</li> <li>100% tuition scholarship after two years of parent's employment</li> </ul>	100% tuition scholarship	Variable based on the college (see <a href="https://www.tuitionexchange.org/information">https://www.tuitionexchange.org/information</a> ) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Full-tuition scholarship               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>8 of the 9 colleges provide full-tuition for dependent children are not providing full-tuition, ranging from 30% to 100%</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Partial tuition scholarship (ca minimum allowed for high-tuit \$26,800) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 1 of the 9 colle now attending scholarship in</li> </ul> </li> <li>• A small number of colleges c (room, board, fees, etc.) in th</li> </ul>
<b>Current Status</b>	Open	Current balance (in semesters): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lewis &amp; Clark* – 29</li> <li>• Reed – (14)</li> <li>• Whitman – (18)</li> <li>• Willamette* – (29); anticipated to be on hold after Fall 2009</li> </ul>	Current balance (in semesters): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 53 (Puget Sound is in good s</li> </ul>

\*Lewis & Clark College, Willamette University, and Seattle University are also members of Tuition Exchange, Inc. Nineteen (19) of the 27 Jesuit/FACHEX colleges/universities are also members of Tuition Exchange, Inc.



## Notes:

- Puget Sound's policy (see <http://www.ups.edu/x17682.xml#partchilededu>) defines a dependent child as one who is claimed as a dependent child on the faculty or staff member's or the faculty or staff member's partner's previous year's income tax return and who is the faculty or staff member's natural or adoptive child or the natural or adoptive child of the faculty or staff member's partner living permanently in the faculty or staff member's home. A divorced faculty or staff member's dependent children, for the purposes of this policy are treated as the dependents of both parents. Court-appointed legal wards and foster children are not eligible for tuition scholarships.
- The education benefits budget currently pays tuition for the equivalent of 63 full-time students, including faculty/staff members and partners as well as dependent children.
- When to contact Human Resources regarding your dependent child's eligibility for/interest in education benefits:
  - When your dependent child is a junior in high school, encourage him/her to explore Puget Sound and the colleges in the three exchange programs to determine which schools he/she is interested in; then at the beginning of your dependent child's senior year in high school, complete the education benefits request form and submit it to Kari Heinold in Human Resources who will certify eligibility and submit a tuition exchange application to schools other than Puget Sound.
  - For all other scenarios, contact Human Resources as soon as possible.
- Whom to call with questions about education benefits: Kari Heinold, HR Assistant, [kheinold@ups.edu](mailto:kheinold@ups.edu), x3442, processes applications for education benefits. Shannon Briggs, Director of Compensation and Benefits, [sbriggs@ups.edu](mailto:sbriggs@ups.edu), x3296, administers the education benefits programs. Rosa Beth Gibson, Associate Vice President for Human Resources/Career & Employment Services, [rgibson@ups.edu](mailto:rgibson@ups.edu), x3116, is responsible for education benefits policies.

B. J. [unclear]

Proposed Amendment(s) to the Faculty Code

The faculty may consider the following amendments separately or in conjunction.

Amendment One — SUBSTITUTE FOR Chapter IV, §1, f [p. 26 lines 42-47 of current *Faculty Code* online]

Faculty members who have had full-time faculty service in other institutions before employment by the University of Puget Sound shall be evaluated for tenure at a time specified in the faculty member's initial contract. If tenure is not granted at the time specified in the initial contract, the next contract shall be terminal. In no case shall the time for consideration of tenure exceed the time set in Section 5 for faculty persons without previous experience

THE FOLLOWING PASSAGE

Faculty members ~~who have had full-time faculty service in other institutions before employment by the University of Puget Sound~~ shall be evaluated for tenure at a ~~by the~~ time specified in the faculty member's initial contract. In no case shall the time for consideration of tenure exceed the time set in ~~Chapter IV, Section 1 e (1) 5 for faculty persons without previous experience.~~ If tenure is not granted ~~at~~ by the time specified in the initial contract, the next contract shall be terminal.

SO THAT Chapter IV, §1, f WOULD READ

Faculty members shall be evaluated for tenure by the time specified in the faculty member's initial contract. In no case shall the time for consideration of tenure exceed the time set in Section ~~chapter iv, Section 1 e (1).~~ If tenure is not granted by the time specified in the initial contract, the next contract shall be terminal.

Amendment Two — SUBSTITUTE FOR Chapter IV, §1, e and e (1) [p. 26 lines 31-36 of current *Faculty Code* online]

The decision to grant tenure must be made no later than during a tenure-line faculty member's sixth year of service at the University of Puget Sound. If tenure is not granted, the next year's contract shall be terminal.