

University of Puget Sound
Faculty Meeting Minutes
May 5, 2009

1. Call to Order

President Ron Thomas called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m. in the Murray Boardroom. 51 people were in attendance at 4:45.

2. Approval of minutes

The minutes for the meeting of April 6, 2009 were approved as posted.

3. Announcements from the floor

President Thomas announced that at 3 p.m. on Monday, May 11, in Rausch Auditorium, members of the cabinet will be offering an update on financial matters such as student retention for next year, and all are urged to come.

4. Report of the President

Thomas reports that this has been a most unpredictable environment for student recruitment. Overall applications were down 6 percent, and our visit traffic was down 10 percent. Everything we are reading in the press says there are special challenges for liberal arts institutions, with “flight to price” and flight to major national research institutions. That said, current deposit numbers are stronger than they have been in a decade. We expect even with “summer melt” to be somewhere between 25 and 50 students over our target, a very unexpected outcome! Deposits were trailing 6-10 percent behind until the last 3-4 days. This is an amazing accomplishment. Thomas offered thanks to all faculty who were specially involved in calling and writing—this makes a huge difference to students and families. A concerted effort was made throughout campus, including expanded and upgraded yield activities, changes to financial aid packaging, and other things that worked in ways not anticipated.

The incoming class is much more financially needy than we’ve seen before, so those good numbers will be needed to make net tuition target. We aim at a 35 percent discount rate, and are at 39 percent as a result of the need level and scholarship packages we have offered. Incoming SAT scores are solid, about at where we’ve been the last couple years. We’ve been steadily increasing, but are not likely to increase this year. The number of transfers students is low for next year; the higher number of freshmen will help compensate for that. Judging by preregistration, retention is steady. This is almost all really good news, with some caveats on the financial and budget pressures. Diversity is strongest we’ve seen, with encouraging increases in every targeted category. Since we had been prepared for a 20% decline in the incoming class, this is all very positive news.

In terms of fundraising, like our fellow institutions we are running behind in almost every category, which also makes additional enrollment important. We’re down 9%, but in a survey of 38 liberal arts colleges, all but 6 are also down, and down by percentages in the mid-teens to mid-20s. We had been increasing 20% every year for the last five, and we are still on track to have our 2nd or 3rd highest year ever. Over the last three months Thomas and the staff in the Development Office have made over 200 calls to donors.

Thomas thanks the reaccreditation team, who did outstanding work preparing the campus and visitors for what was the most positive reaccreditation visit he has ever seen (from either side of the process). Thanks to all who contributed, and special thanks to the leadership of the Reaccreditation Task Force, Alyce DeMarais, and Sarah Moore.

Finally, it is impressive to see the accomplishments of our graduating seniors. Thanks to all for great work with these students over the last four years.

5. Report of the Academic Vice-President

Dean Bartanen seconds President Thomas on all the thank-yous.

6. Report of the Chair of the Faculty Senate

As Professor Doug Cannon had not yet arrived, there was no report.

7. Changes to Evaluation Forms (continuing business)

Professor Suzanne Holland noted that at the last faculty meeting we agreed to continue our discussion of the forms. Recall that the ad hoc committee proposed three options for a revised course evaluation form (**attached**). Professors Holland, Steven Neshyba, and Greta Austin are trying them in their classes. Associate Dean Sarah Moore had suggested some questions to ask the students who use the forms to get their feedback (evaluation evaluations!), so the department secretary attached questionnaires. Holland used version C, and the students liked it, finding it compact, clear, and not daunting.

Holland asked for thoughts, comments, or suggestions. Neshyba said that the informal feedback he had received on Option C was that students were glad it was shorter. Holland said Lorraine Toler, who administered Option B to the students in one class, said that the students universally appreciated the form.

Professor David Tinsley said that there is a persistent problem, that there is a lack of clarity whether the course or the instructor is being evaluated. He uses his own forms when he's not officially up for evaluation, because they are more useful to him in shaping a course. Moore said that the revisions did try to address this problem with questions on the back, but it doesn't provide the type of feedback that some people are seeking. There was some further discussion about whether there could be two distinct forms, one on course evaluation and one on instructor evaluation, with the former perhaps being a boilerplate that could be adapted by the instructor. Holland said that it would not be desirable to add to the amount of time we're asking of students, and that giving them two forms to fill out would be onerous. Another suggestion was that the form begin with course evaluation and then move explicitly to a section calling for instructor evaluation.

The issue of the question, "What grade do you believe you deserve in this course?" came up. It was suggested that "deserve" should be changed to "earned," or that effort and grade should not be together in the same sentence. It was noted that the forms currently in use include a question about why a student is taking a course, which is helpful for assessing a student's attitude; Moore said that this had been removed in an effort to shorten the forms as much as possible. Professor Carolyn Weisz said that it would be more useful to know how much effort a student put into this course relative to the others he/she was taking. Professor Eric Orlin suggested asking how many hours per week the student devoted to the class. Neshyba suggested asking them to indicate

whether they spend more time, less, or the same amount of time on this class as their others.

Professor David Sousa said Option C asks students to shoehorn too many different items into single numerical ratings. Professor Keith Ward said he was in favor of Option A, which speaks to Sousa's concern, takes the issues raised in Option C and breaks them down into something we are more familiar with. It gives students a better sense of what we mean in each category, which would also help the FAC understand students' comments better than the more bunched-together approach of Option C.

Professor Alexa Tullis said she supports Option A, but would like it to include the final question that is on the other options: "Please provide any feedback you have about the course that would be helpful for the instructor to know in preparing to teach this course again." This combines instructor and course. Tullis also said she knows of at least one university locally whose evaluation forms are titled more accurately to reflect that these are students' *perceptions* of teaching and course quality.

Ward said that many students use the last section of the evaluation as a summary, to pull together their thoughts. When they're asked to provide an overall numerical rating, they use that to reflect on their whole experience, and it leads to a sense of what was the most valuable and important.

Professor Judith Kay said she likes Option A, but that question 6a on the 2nd page invites confusion between instructor and course, because it asks students to consider their comments about both, then to provide an overall rating for the course. Weisz said she doesn't think it makes sense to scrupulously separate the two, since the course reflects the qualities of the instructor. What we want is to avoid having students evaluate instructors *personally*, and so it would be preferable to put more emphasis on rating the course. A faculty member noted that in team taught courses, there is a particularly strong distinction to be made between course and instruction.

Tinsley clarified that the distinction he was making regarded the purpose of the document: whether it was being used as a way of improving a course, or as a way of evaluating an instructor.

Professor Karim Ochoi raised concerns about evaluation forms in general. First, he said he would like to see some psychometric research providing evidence that the questions assess what they claim to. Second, he is concerned about how the evaluations are used and interpreted. Third, the forms can be used by students for retaliation against a minority faculty member put in a position of authority, and then the faculty member finds him- or herself dependent on the goodwill of those who read the evaluations. If Puget Sound stands by its claim to want diversity, it needs to reflect on the impact of diversity on evaluations. He urged that those with expertise in such matters, such Professor Grace Livingston, be invited to give their input.

Ochoi also expressed concern about the tendency of students to use evaluations to give an instructor a "bad grade" in retaliation for a low test score. He expressed support for Options A and B because they call for students to "agree" or "disagree," rather than to assign grades to their instructors.

There was a straw poll about the different versions; Option A received a clear majority, while B received no votes and C only a few. After some discussion, it was agreed that the subcommittee would continue tinkering with Option A over the summer, then bring it back for a vote at the first faculty meeting in the fall. The Professional

Standards Committee may be invited to vet it. **Holland invited all interested parties to participate in the tinkering over the summer.** The original committee was just Sue Hannaford, Rob Hutchinson, Sarah Moore, Suzanne Holland, and Robin Foster.

Holland noted that this has already been a lengthy process, the survey having been done last spring. Moore said that the survey reflected that there are two separate issues to work out, one having to do with the forms themselves, the other with how the forms are interpreted and used, including considerations of how race and gender factor in. We are currently at work on the first issue, but need to get back to the second, more difficult one.

8. Abolition of the Pass/Fail Option (continuing business)

Seth Weinberger reported that at the last meeting of Fall 2008, the Academic Standards Committee voted unanimously to abolish P/F for academic courses. The Senate requested that Weinberger come before the full faculty and gather opinions on the matter.

The ASC's decision began with the premise that the P/F option, when used appropriately, encourages students to take challenging courses outside of their comfort zones without jeopardizing their GPAs. What brought the issue before the ASC was the concern that some faculty members raised about certain courses attracting large numbers (perhaps 10-15%) of P/F students who then bring the quality down for all of the students because they are not as committed to the course. Anecdotally, this is a particular problem in creative writing, personal finance, and art courses.

Other problems with P/F include students taking P/F "excess" courses in their majors, which runs counter to the intent of the P/F option, and is problematic in terms of calculating GPA within the major. There have also been problems with underclassmen taking intro courses P/F and then deciding to major in the subject; this too runs counter to the intent of the P/F option. Every year a handful of students accidentally register for courses P/F and then have to petition the ASC in order to graduate, and a couple fail their P/F courses and can't graduate. The Registrar says that students do as well in courses taken P/F as they do in those taken for a grade.

Weinberger did an informal survey of comparable institutions and found that we have the most lax P/F policy. Lewis and Clark and Reed require instructor permission. Most schools require instructor permission, and/or restrict the option to juniors and seniors, and/or do not permit P/F within one's major department. Puget Sound's current policy is that students may take up to a total of four courses P/F, and the professor does not know who is registered P/F.

The ASC considered a variety of options, including requiring instructor permission, giving instructors knowledge of which students are registered P/F, allowing instructors to opt out of giving students the P/F option in their courses, forbidding students from registering P/F within their majors, limiting the P/F option to students with at least a certain minimum GPA, or restricting it to upperclassmen. With this, Weinberger invited faculty to weigh in.

In the discussion that ensued, several faculty members expressed the desire for individual instructors or departments to be able to opt out of offering the P/F option, rather than having it removed campus-wide, a move that some saw as part of a gradual erosion of faculty members' rights. Some professors spoke against P/F, saying that students were not committed to classes they took P/F, performed very poorly on group

projects, and generally lowered the quality of a course. Others spoke in favor of P/F, saying that it enabled students to think less about grades and more about material. Neshyba moved that the faculty accept the ASC resolution; motion was seconded. Professor Bill Haltom urged that faculty vote no, because the agenda did not indicate that there would be a vote on this issue. **The motion was defeated on a voice vote.**

Weinberger took a straw poll to see what options the faculty preferred:

Policy as is: 0 votes

Instructor permission for individual students (a P/F code): 34

Permission tied to course, not instructor (blind P/F): 24

University requirement that P/F not allowed within major department: 0

Underclassmen not permitted to take courses P/F: 16

No restriction to underclassmen: 17

Favored abolition but voted no because of procedural issue: 2

GPA-linked restriction: 1

Increased liberalization of current policy: 6

9. Vote on Revisions to Early Tenure and Promotion Section of Faculty Code

Professor, and Faculty Senate Chair, Doug Cannon provided side-by-side documents (**attached**) for comparison. The motion on the floor is in order to permit early consideration for tenure and promotion while maintaining the standard that one is only to be considered for tenure once. There are four replacement clauses in Chapter IV required to effectuate the motion.

(1) Section 1 e and 1 e (1) are replaced by the clauses to the right; notice especially that the revised 1 e1 mandates an “up-or-out” policy. All consideration for tenure is governed by the same clauses.

(2) The revised Section 1 f corrects an error; the old version refers to a part of the Code that no longer exists.

(3) The revised Section 2 b 4 specifies that no matter when one is considered for promotion, the grounds are as set out in Chapter IV, Section 2 c.

(4) The interpretation under Chapter IV is removed, since the new Section 2 b 4 nullifies it.

Kay inquired about the friendly amendment Dean Bartanen had made at the last faculty meeting about the family leave policy. Cannon said that Bartanen had been concerned about the phrase in Section 1 f, “In no case shall the time for consideration of tenure exceed the time set in Chapter IV, Section 1 e.” Section 1 e 2 provides for flexibility about this, whether under the family leave policy or any other. It reads: “Approved leaves may be exempted from computation time for tenure consideration in accordance with published university policies or by agreement between the faculty member and the dean.” Bartanen and Kay both found this satisfactory.

Tinsley noted that deleting the Interpretation deletes the description of “sustained record of achievement of exceptional merit,” and asked whether it was the FAC’s view that the criteria under which an early decision would be made are identical to those outlined elsewhere. Cannon responded that the point of the amendment is to establish that

one is considered for promotion under same standard regardless of when one comes up for it. This obviates the “exceptional merit” distinction, because the standard is the same.

In a voice vote, the motion passed.

10. Vote on Proposed Revisions to Student Life Committee Bylaw

Professor Nick Kontogeorgopoulos said that these revisions (**attached**) were introduced for a first reading at the last faculty meeting. The motion is to revise Article V, Section 6F(b) of the Faculty Bylaws, pertaining to the duties of the Student Life Committee, in order to make it easier for future committee members to do their work by clarifying what that work should be. This change has been endorsed by the Faculty Senate.

In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

11. Discussion of Location for Faculty Meetings

A consensus was reached that next year’s meetings will be held in Thompson 193.

12. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Gwynne Brown
Secretary of the Faculty

**Instructor and Course Evaluation Form
Option A**

To the Student: The evaluation you are about to write is an important document for your instructor. The information provided will be used by the university in the evaluation of your instructor's teaching. It will also be used by the instructor for improving course structure and teaching. Your evaluation does count. You are encouraged to respond thoughtfully, to take this evaluation seriously, and to provide written remarks; we have allowed time for you to reflect and provide an honest appraisal.

Your instructor will not see these evaluation forms until after he or she has turned in final grades. If you do not want the instructor to see your hand-written form, check this box and your responses will be typed before it is given to the instructor.

Course# _____ Semester _____ Year _____ Instructor's Name _____

1. Student Background Information

A. Major _____ Minor (if applicable) _____

B. Status: First year Sophomore Junior Senior Graduate Student

2. Instructor's Promotion of Students' Learning

	Disagree			Agree	
a. The instructor was intellectually challenging	1	2	3	4	5
b. The instructor was skilled in helping students master relevant concepts and skills	1	2	3	4	5
c. The instructor encouraged students to take learning seriously and to think critically	1	2	3	4	5
d. The instructor encouraged students' intellectual self-reliance and self-motivation	1	2	3	4	5
e. Class assignments (e.g., homework, lab reports, papers, readings) were useful learning tools.	1	2	3	4	5
f. The instructor presented material in a clear manner.	1	2	3	4	5

Please explain the choices you checked above with comments that help give context to your ratings.

3. Instructor's Organization and Ability to Establish Clear Expectations

	Disagree			Agree	
a. Overall, the course was well organized.	1	2	3	4	5
b. The instructor was well prepared for each class session.	1	2	3	4	5
c. The instructor established clear expectations of students' responsibilities.	1	2	3	4	5

Please explain the choices you checked above with comments that help give context to your ratings.

4. **Instructor's Interaction With Students**

	Disagree			Agree	
a. showed concern for the students' understanding of the material.	1	2	3	4	5
b. was respectful of a variety of viewpoints.	1	2	3	4	5
c. was available during office hours and/or by appointment.	1	2	3	4	5
d. led students to engage the course material.	1	2	3	4	5

Please explain the choices you checked above with comments that help give context to your ratings.

5. **Instructor's Evaluation of Students' Learning**

	Disagree			Agree	
a. Tests, quizzes, papers, homework, etc., were consistent with the course's contents and objectives.	1	2	3	4	5
b. The instructor provided reasonable preparation for tests and quizzes.	1	2	3	4	5
c. The instructor did a thorough job of evaluating my work.	1	2	3	4	5

Please explain the choices you checked above with comments that help give context to your ratings.

6. **Overall Rating of Course and Instructor**

- a. After carefully considering the items above, provide an overall rating of this course. Poor
1 2 3 4 5
- b. What grade do you anticipate receiving in this course? _____
- c. Considering the effort and quality of your work, what grade do you believe you deserve in this course? _____
- d. With reference to the subject in this course, please explain how and why your interest and/or curiosity have increased or decreased over the duration of the semester.

- e. After carefully considering the items above, provide an overall rating of your instructor. Poor
1 2 3 4 5
- f. Please describe what you think your instructor does best and what you think should be improved.

**Instructor and Course Evaluation Form
Option B**

To the Student: The evaluation you are about to write is an important document for your instructor. The information provided will be used by the university in the evaluation of your instructor's teaching. It will also be used by the instructor for improving course structure and teaching. Your evaluation does count. You are encouraged to respond thoughtfully, to take this evaluation seriously, and to provide written remarks; we have allowed time for you to reflect and provide an honest appraisal.

Your instructor will not see these evaluation forms until after he or she has turned in final grades. If you do not want the instructor to see your hand-written form, check this box and your responses will be typed before it is given to the instructor.

Course# _____ Semester _____ Year _____ Instructor's Name _____

1. Background Information

A. Major _____ Minor (if applicable) _____

B. Status: First year Sophomore Junior Senior Graduate Student

2. Rating of Instructor Please consider and rate each of the following:

	Disagree					Agree				
a. The instructor was intellectually challenging	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
b. The instructor was skilled in helping students master relevant concepts and skills	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
c. The instructor encouraged students to take learning seriously and to think critically	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
d. The instructor encouraged students' intellectual self-reliance and self-motivation	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
e. Class assignments (e.g., homework, lab reports, papers, readings) were useful learning tools.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
f. The instructor presented material in a clear manner.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
g. The instructor was well prepared for each class session.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
h. The instructor established clear expectations of students' responsibilities.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
i. The instructor showed concern for the students' understanding of the material.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
j. The instructor was respectful of a variety of viewpoints.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
k. The instructor was available during office hours and/or by appointment.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
l. The instructor led students to engage the course material.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
m. Tests, quizzes, papers, homework, etc., were consistent with the course's contents and objectives.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
n. The instructor provided reasonable preparation for papers, tests, and quizzes.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
o. The instructor did a thorough job of evaluating my work.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5

3. **Overall Instructor Evaluation:**

- | | Poor | | | Excellent | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|---|---|-----------|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| a. After carefully considering the items above, provide an overall rating of your <u>instructor</u> . | | | | | |
| b. Please describe what you think your <u>instructor</u> does best and what you think should be improved. | | | | | |

4. **Overall Course Evaluation:**

- | | Poor | | | Excellent | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|---|---|-----------|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| a. Please provide an overall rating of this <u>course</u> . | | | | | |
| b. What grade do you anticipate <u>receiving</u> in this course? _____ | | | | | |
| c. Considering the effort and quality of your work, what grade do you believe you <u>deserve</u> in this course? _____ | | | | | |
| d. With reference to the subject in this course, please explain how and why your interest and/or curiosity have increased or decreased over the duration of the semester. | | | | | |
| e. Please provide any feedback you have about the <u>course</u> that would be helpful for the instructor to know the next time s/he teaches it. | | | | | |

**Instructor and Course Evaluation Form
Option C**

To the Student: The evaluation you are about to write is an important document for your instructor. The information provided will be used by the university in the evaluation of your instructor's teaching. It will also be used by the instructor for improving course structure and teaching. Your evaluation does count. You are encouraged to respond thoughtfully, to take this evaluation seriously, and to provide written remarks; we have allowed time for you to reflect and provide an honest appraisal.

Your instructor will not see these evaluation forms until after he or she has turned in final grades. If you do not want the instructor to see your hand-written form, check this box and your responses will be typed before it is given to the instructor.

Course# _____ Semester _____ Year _____ Instructor's Name _____

1. Background Information

A. Major _____ Minor (if applicable) _____

B. Status: First year Sophomore Junior Senior Graduate Student

2. Please rate the following areas as related to your Instructor. Provide comments to clarify and provide context to your rating.

	Poor				Excellent
a. Instructor's Promotion of Student Learning: (e.g., intellectual challenge, promotion of critical thinking, intellectual self-reliance)	1	2	3	4	5

Comment:

	Poor				Excellent
b. Preparation of Instructor: (e.g., use of class time, organization of course and class sessions)	1	2	3	4	5

Comment:

	Poor				Excellent
c. Instructor's Communication: (e.g., clarity of explanations and presentation of material, clarity of expectations of student work and role)	1	2	3	4	5

Comment:

- | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|------|---|---|---|---|-----------|
| | | Poor | | | | | Excellent |
| d. Instructor Interaction with Students: (e.g., rapport and availability of instructor, openness to other points of view, concern for student learning) | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |

Comment:

- | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|------|---|---|---|---|-----------|
| | | Poor | | | | | Excellent |
| e. Evaluation of Student Learning: (e.g., methods of evaluation, helpfulness of feedback on work, timeliness of feedback on work) | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |

Comment:

3. Overall Instructor Evaluation:

- | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|------|---|---|---|---|-----------|
| | | Poor | | | | | Excellent |
| a. After carefully considering the items above, provide an overall rating of your <u>instructor</u> . | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
- b. Please describe what you think your instructor does best and what you think could be improved.

4. Overall Course Evaluation:

- | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|--|------|---|---|---|---|-----------|
| | | Poor | | | | | Excellent |
| a. Please provide an overall rating of this <u>course</u> . | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
- b. What grade do you anticipate receiving in this course? _____
- c. Considering the effort and quality of your work, what grade do you believe you deserve in this course? _____
- d. With reference to the subject in this course, please explain how and why your interest and/or curiosity have increased or decreased over the duration of the semester.
- e. Please provide any feedback you have about the course that would be helpful for the instructor to know in preparing to teach this course again.

CHAPTER IV

TENURE AND PROMOTION OF FACULTY

Section 1 - Tenure

b. Tenure offers protection for academic freedom and security. It must be earned through superior professional achievement. Tenure is a career-long commitment by the university to the faculty member and should be regarded by both parties with great care. The tenure decision is usually the most important decision the university makes concerning a faculty member's entire career.

d. The service previous to tenure is a trial period in which the faculty member's fitness for tenure is tested. The criteria for the awarding of tenure are contained in Chapter III, Section 3 d.

e. The decision to grant tenure must be made not later than during a tenure-line faculty member's sixth year of tenure-line service at the University of Puget Sound. If tenure is not granted, the next year's contract shall be terminal.

(1) Tenure may be granted earlier for relevant previous experience or exceptional achievement.

e. If a decision is made to grant tenure, it must be made not later than during a tenure-line faculty member's sixth year of tenure-line service at the University of Puget Sound. If tenure is not granted after any evaluation for tenure, the next year's contract shall be terminal. **[Note how revised wording clearly mandates an "up-or-out" policy]**

(1) Upon application of a faculty member and agreement of both the dean and the head officer of the faculty member's program department, or school, faculty may be considered for tenure before the sixth year of tenure-line service at the University of Puget Sound. Upon such application and agreement, faculty may be considered for tenure before a time specified in the faculty member's initial contract. No matter when a faculty member is considered for tenure, the decision shall be governed by Chapter IV, Section 1, b and d.

f. 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.

Section 2 - Promotion

b. Tenure-line faculty are considered for promotion to the next higher rank at the following points in their time of service at the University of Puget Sound.

- (1) Assistant professors are normally considered for promotion during their sixth year in that rank at the university unless otherwise specified in their letter of appointment; and
- (2) Associate professors are most often considered for promotion during their sixth year in that rank at the university, but the decision when to request consideration for promotion rests with the faculty member.
- (3) Approved leaves are generally included in computing time for promotion provided that the work done on leave has a direct correlation to one's academic and professional responsibilities. This procedure must be approved in advance by the faculty member's head officer and the dean.
- (4) A faculty member who wishes early promotion and believes grounds exist for it shall request it in writing to the head officer and the dean. The dean shall then initiate the evaluation proceedings.

c. Faculty promotion shall be based upon the quality of a person's performance of academic duties. The criteria for promotion are specified in Chapter III, Section 3 e. Promotion shall be made only after evaluation of the faculty member in the manner provided in Chapter III of this code.

f. 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 by a time to be specified in the faculty member's initial contract. If tenure is not granted by the time specified in the initial contract, the next year's contract shall be terminal. In no case shall the time for consideration of tenure exceed the time set in Chapter IV, Section 1 e. **[Note: There is no section 5 of Chapter V. The reference is a vestige of an earlier version of the code. It is corrected in this amendment.]**

(4) A faculty member who wishes early promotion and believes grounds exist for it may request it in writing to the head officer and the dean. The dean may then initiate the evaluation proceedings. No matter when a faculty member is considered for promotion, the grounds shall be as set out in Chapter IV, Section. 2 c.

CHAPTER IV

Interpretation of Chapter IV, Section 2, b (4). Expectations for Early Promotion (Memorandum to Professional Standards Committee from Faculty Advancement Committee, 9 February 1987 requesting discussion and approval)

Early promotion is an unusual and exceptional circumstance in the process of advancement. The schedule for advancement and tenure as outlined in the Faculty Code represents the agreement of the faculty on when its members ought to come up for Faculty Code 47 evaluation. If, however, an individual has assembled a sustained record of achievement of exceptional merit in all the categories by which a faculty member is evaluated, he or she might request to be promoted or granted tenure before the usual time as stipulated by the Faculty Code. In such instances, the university might well wish to consider early promotion as an indication of its special appreciation for and commitment to faculty members of exceptional achievement. In any case, it is incumbent upon the faculty member and his/her department in cases of early promotion to demonstrate that the above-mentioned criteria have been met.

[This interpretation is nullified and will be deleted from future editions of the Code, except in a historical archive.]

Proposed revisions to Article V, Section 6f(b) of the Faculty Bylaws (added language in italics)

The duties of the Committee shall be

1. To act as a liaison on student life issues among students, staff, faculty, and the administration. *This includes providing input on various Student Affairs projects and initiatives as brought to the Committee by the Dean of Students, as well as establishing ongoing communication with and providing input to ASUPS on various projects at the request of that body's executives.*
2. *To review information sources available that could help identify issues relevant to student life. Such information sources include individual faculty, students, and staff, as well as the Office of Institutional Research and the ASUPS Student Concerns Committee.*
3. To conduct reviews and make recommendations ~~as necessary~~ about those policies and procedures that affect students' lives outside the classroom.
4. To conduct reviews and make recommendations ~~as necessary~~ about co-curricular programs and services.
5. *To serve as a pool of faculty from which to draw for participation on Student Affairs ad hoc committees.*
6. Such other duties as may be assigned to it.