

University of Puget Sound Faculty Senate
26 October 2009, 4:00, Murray Boardroom

Present: Kristin Johnson, Kris Bartanen, Lisa Johnson, Fred Hamel, Kelli Delaney, Richard Anderson-Connolly, James Luu, Stacey Weiss, Mike Segawa, Douglas Cannon, Steven Neshyba, Dan Burgard, Keith Ward, Rob Hutchinson, Tiffany Aldrich MacBain, Bill Barry, Marc Phillips.

Attachments: Chair Cannon's letter to Board of Trustees
IEC End-of-the-Year Report

- I. **M/S/P** Approval of Minutes of September 28 **as corrected.**
- II. **M/S/P** Approval of Minutes of October 5.
- III. Announcements:
 - a. RAC noted that minutes for committees have not appeared on the new website, but will be posted soon, and Neshyba noted the Senate webpage will also eventually be updated.
 - b. Chair Cannon noted the changes to honorary degree policy were approved by the Board of Trustees, but the Academic and Student Affairs Committee declined to forward the revision to the Bylaws regarding the Diversity Committee, and requested that a revised version be submitted. Members of the committee offered to participate in such a revision and draft clearer language. Bartanen noted (and Luu agreed) that the committee understood the goals of the amendment and did not intend to usurp the faculty's responsibilities to self-governance but were concerned that the wording regarding BERT (Bias-Hate Education Response Team) was unclear. Whether this development affects the charges given to the DC is yet to be determined. RAC asked whether he could be involved in the rewriting, given his concerns regarding BERT. Such revisions will come before the full faculty. Cannon noted Nancy Bristow and Kim Bobby were present at the meeting, as well as the faculty representative to the Board, Nick Kontogeorgopoulos.
 - c. Chair Cannon brought attention to his letter to the Board of Trustees, and the fact committee charges have dominated senate business this semester.
- IV. Special Orders
 - a. Neshyba asked for clarification regarding article IV section 6 regarding when an incumbent senator is elected chairperson, and whether the chair has voting powers. Chair Cannon noted that if a senator is elected chair, the result is the senate is indeed short a member. It was recognized that the Chair is a voting member of the Senate.
- V. Reports of Committee Liaisons
 - a. Aldrich MacBain asked on behalf of the Diversity Committee how to obtain access to numbers on retention of students of color. Segawa offered to provide the info.
 - b. Neshyba as a member of senate subcommittee to the Ad-Hoc Benefits Task Force shared the meeting plans of that subcommittee, and that a way of surveying faculty for concerns regarding benefits is being developed.
 - c. RAC noted that Charge 4 of International Educational Committee needs discussion eventually, but that the chairs were happy with the charges otherwise.
- VI. **M/S/P** Receipt of revised 2008-2009 Report of IEC
- VII. Proposed charges to PSC
 - a. **M/S/P** (as amended below) Ward moved that we charge PSC with charges 1-9, and after receiving a second, explained his conversations with Chair Haltom regarding the charges: Namely, that Charge 1 addresses an ambiguity in the Faculty Code in

Chapter 1 Part b section 1 when the Code defines tenure line faculty in such a way that excluded tenured faculty (a “housekeeping amendment”), and that subcommittees are working on Charges 2 and 4. Ward explained the reasoning for deleting various charges (on the grounds of redundancy, completion, and – in the case of additional word on evaluation forms to discourage harassment – the PSC’s stance that such language would not discourage harassment).

i. Discussion:

1. Hutchinson noted the faculty survey regarding instructor evaluation already established strong feelings against electronic evaluations (charge 7). **M/S amendment to remove Charge 7.** Lisa Johnson suggested electronic evaluations would be more sustainable and offered that the evaluations could be required before grade submissions. Luu raised a concern regarding confidentiality with electronic submissions. Cannon raised the procedural issue of whether if there is concern on this issue it should be given to the PSC or whether the senate or faculty should deal with it. **Motion failed.**
2. Barry suggested that given larger issues regarding evaluation forms, it would be more efficient for the PSC to provide an opinion regarding the instructor evaluations (i.e. version A, B & C), based on their expertise and experience studying the process of faculty evaluation. Bartanen suggested this already falls within the duties of the committee as stated in the Bylaws, but Barry requested a more specific direction be given to the PSC. Bartanen offered that based on the straw poll Form A has been made available for a trial run this Fall. Ward offered that we could revisit this issue once data on Form A is obtained.

- b. Cannon explained the background for potential additional charges regarding,
- i. standards of professional growth, about which concerns were expressed by two successive FAC year-end reports (for example, variability of standards). Cannon shared an exchange regarding whether the PSC had authority to ensure consistency of evaluation between departments, versus conformity of departmental standards with the Code. They did have authority to post the departmental standards, and did so (under Faculty Policies). Cannon noted that clearer university standards might resolve the issue, given recent developments that raise the importance of having clear criteria. He noted the presence of concern that in last year’s evaluations substantial uncertainties regarding standards of promotion regarding professional growth existed. Ward offered (and Bartanen agreed) that the PSC was uncomfortable composing language regarding standards, versus interpreting language composed by the faculty. Bartanen noted that the PSC looks at departmental guidelines independently from each other, and the FAC uses these guidelines for particular evaluations. A recent PSC meeting discussed possible revision of the professional growth section of the *Faculty Evaluation Criteria & Procedures* document. Burgard queried whether the anxiety arose from departmental differences or other issues? Ward offered that this issue speaks to a larger question of a change in culture, from departments evaluating according to criteria particular to disciplines in recognition of differences, to something else. RAC expressed hesitancy to give the PSC a charge they do not want (i.e. code writing), and RAC, Barry and Ward noted that perhaps a regular cycle of review of departmental

criteria and priorities is needed. Bartanen pointed out uniformity of criteria is not the aim, but rather equity across departments. Hamel asked what body provides a more horizontal perspective on evaluation criteria across programs and departments? Lisa Johnson expressed appreciation of the federalist model of the university and the relationships between departments and governing bodies, and argued the PSC not be charged with instilling uniformity. If there is a lack of clarity, each department should address such problems. Neshyba requested that more than anecdotal evidence of concern guide the senate's discussion on the manner. Cannon noted the passing time and proposed that open/closed files be placed on the next agenda.

MSP to adjourn.

Signed,
Kristin Johnson
Scribe of the Day

Richard Anderson-Connolly
Faculty Senate Secretary