

**University of Puget Sound  
Faculty Meeting Minutes  
September 9, 2003**

1. President Thomas called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m. in McIntyre 103. Fifty-five voting members of the faculty were present by 4:15.
2. John Finney was elected faculty secretary for the 2003-2004 year.
3. Minutes of the May 8, 2003 faculty meeting were approved as distributed.
4. In response to President Thomas's call for announcements, David Droge introduced student Cleo Peterson who stood, along with three other students, and invited faculty participation in a series of Conspiracy of Hope events scheduled for February 2004. She said this would be the second year for Conspiracy of Hope, and that faculty would receive a letter about it.

Bill Beardsley announced the first Faculty Club-sponsored party of the year and invited all faculty, even non-members, to attend this Friday, September 12, 2003, from 4:00-8:00 p.m. at the Faculty Club at 3201 N. 14<sup>th</sup>.

Dean of Students Kris Bartanen announced (1) a gathering tomorrow, September 10, 2003, in the Wheelock Student Center Board Room for faculty interested in serving as mentors to the fraternities and sororities as they work on academic program development. She invited all interested faculty to attend; (2) the second Mellon grant for residential life to focus on civic discourse in academic communities. She said the grant has two parts, one to support co-curricular programs connected to first-year seminars and one to develop sophomore year programs. She invited faculty interested in getting involved to contact her; and (3) the "take a faculty member to lunch" program. She said that her office has funds to make it possible for students to invite faculty to lunch, but reminded us that the fund does not have sufficient resources to support seminar and lab group refreshments.

Vice President for Enrollment George Mills announced that Saturday, September 20 was campus day for prospective students and their parents. He invited interested faculty to become involved.

Michel Rocchi asked us to be on the lookout for a mailing about the upcoming Hispanic Heritage Celebration, sponsored by ASUPS lectures.

5. President Thomas made a few announcements. He reminded us about tonight's David Halberstam lecture in the Fieldhouse, the second in the annual Susan Resneck Pierce Lectures in Public Affairs and the Arts. He then thanked Karin Sable and Ross Singleton for agreeing to serve on the Master Planning Advisory Task Force. He said that he has asked the task force to make regular reports to the campus and the community during the planning process, and that he is consulting with the Faculty Senate on ways of ensuring broad campus engagement during the planning process.

President Thomas reported that research on new admissions material design and content is proceeding and that the principal writer is on campus this week to interview faculty and students. He said this was a very important project. President Thomas said he has asked Terry Cooney and George Mills to create a venue for reporting to the campus community progress on developing this material.

President Thomas said that his schedule has been very tight and that, while he has been able to meet with many of us and over time wishes to meet with every department on campus, he is disappointed he cannot arrange more meetings with individuals. He said he will try to carve out a couple of hours (8:00 to 10:00) on most upcoming Monday mornings when he will be at

Diversions Cafe with no scheduled appointments. He invited us to approach him in Diversions for conversation if we would like to do so.

6. Dean Terry Cooney said that a meeting on the new view book for prospective students is scheduled for Tuesday, October 14 to provide an opportunity for faculty to comment on what the view book says about the role of the faculty. He said we would all receive an announcement about the meeting and he invited us to attend.

Dean Cooney also invited faculty feedback on how well we think the new freshman seminars are going, given that this is the first year of the new core curriculum.

7. Faculty Senate Chair Bill Beardsley reported that the first meeting of the Faculty Senate was held yesterday, and the next meeting would be held September 22<sup>nd</sup>. He reminded us that senate meetings are open to all faculty. He said that President Thomas was invited to meet with the senate at an upcoming convenient date. Beardsley reminded us that there is a senate web site (at <http://www.ups.edu/dean/senate/home.shtml>) and that it includes a suggestion box for contacting senators. He promised serious consideration of all suggestions received.
8. We turned to the first reading of the proposed amendment to Chapter III, section 5 [insert between 4 and 5, renumber old section 5] of the Faculty Code. Copies of the proposal were attached to the agenda for today's meeting and are attached to these minutes. Hard copies were available at the meeting. President Thomas turned to Beardsley for the first reading. Beardsley reminded us that a first reading must precede by at least two weeks any action on a proposed code revision, so we would not be taking any action today.

Beardsley spoke briefly to the reasons for the proposed revision. These reasons were also detailed in an April 2, 2003 memorandum from the Professional Standards Committee (PSC) to the Faculty Senate. Copies of the memorandum were attached to the agenda for today's meeting and are attached to these minutes. Hard copies were available at the meeting. He said the proposal was in response to a charge from the senate to consider how to streamline the faculty evaluation process. Allowing as an option a shorter evaluation for associate professors in their third year and for full professors in alternate five year periods was seen by PSC as being the best way to accomplish this. He said these reviews would be as rigorous as regular reviews, but would take less time because they would not go to the Faculty Advancement Committee (FAC). He thought that perhaps between eight and ten faculty might have the opportunity to select the shorter evaluation each year.

Grace Kirchner asked if the PSC had considered lengthening the period of time between instructor evaluations (currently three years) as another way to streamline the evaluation process. Dean Cooney said the PSC had not discussed that.

Andy Rex asked what our accrediting agency would think of the proposed streamlined procedure. Dean Cooney responded that the accrediting agency is concerned with the timing of evaluations, not how they are done. He said they "wouldn't even blink over this."

Carolyn Weisz asked if departments could decide whether or not they wished to embrace this option. Beardsley responded that the proposal is written to create an option, not to grant a right. Departments could decide to do it the old way. Dean Cooney added that the PSC had noted that in small departments a junior faculty member might come up for review without ever having seen a regular review if senior colleagues had always chosen the shorter option. He said this might be a situation in which a department would elect a full review in order that a junior colleague would have experience with it. He concluded that the proposed option might therefore have a greater impact on larger departments;

Julian Edgoose asked if he were correct that under the proposal only three people would have access to the file (the evaluatee, the head officer, and the dean), and Beardsley responded that was correct.

President Thomas asked what the department head's foundation would be for deciding whether to use the shorter option. Beardsley responded that the proposed code revision included the statement, "In making this decision the head officer shall consider information gathered from student evaluations of teaching, evidence gathered from any class visitations and the results of previous evaluations.

David Tinsley asked if the department could override the chair when the evaluatee, the chair and the dean elect the short process and other department members prefer the regular one. Beardsley responded, "no."

Suzanne Barnett worried that the short process could eliminate from the evaluation process the involvement of persons outside the department who may have a perspective to offer on the evaluatee's interdisciplinary activities. She suggested that evaluatees involved in interdisciplinary activities might therefore always choose the long process and be seen as "troublesome" by their department colleagues. Dean Cooney reminded us that the PSC proposal was a response to a request for streamlining and that all it does is provide another option. He said the evaluatee has complete freedom to choose the full process and that there should not be any repercussions for making this choice. President Thomas added that in his experience this kind of shorter evaluation was frequently an option at comparable institutions.

Dash Goodman asked if the PSC considered making the evaluation files open to the department so that the department, rather than the chair, could decide whether to go with the shorter option. Beardsley responded that the PSC did talk about this and concluded that the more such options there were, the less streamlined the process would be. Dean Cooney reminded us that an evaluation can be called for at any time, independent of the established schedule, and that in proposing this shorter option, the PSC was working within that setting. There is nothing, he said, to preclude the department's deciding to be involved.

Barnett expressed concern that the various faculty awards that currently flow from FAC involvement in evaluations might be unavailable to faculty selecting the shorter option. She worried that with the new option in place, the evaluation system might favor for awards those faculty who selected the full process. Beardsley said that selecting award recipients was an issue of practice, not of code, and that if the code is revised, practices for selecting award recipients should be reviewed.

There being no further discussion or business, we adjourned at 4:42 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John M. Finney  
Secretary of the Faculty

Chapter III, section 5 [insert between 4 and 5, renumber old section 5]

#### Evaluation by Head Officer and Dean

In certain circumstances evaluation of senior faculty may proceed under an alternative process involving only the head officer and the dean. As is the case with the process described in Chapter III section 4, this alternative process is designed to provide a substantial body of evidence in writing as the basis for a fair and impartial review.

- a. Persons in the rank of associate professor who are not candidates for tenure or promotion and professors in years 5, 15, and 25 of service in that rank may elect to bypass the procedures for evaluation detailed in Chapter III, section 4 and have their next scheduled review conducted by the head officer and dean under the procedures described in this section.
- b. Faculty members choosing to be evaluated under the process described in this section must consult with their head officer at least two months prior to the start of the semester in which the evaluation is scheduled. The head officer shall determine whether a full review under Chapter III, section 4 is warranted or if the review will proceed under the procedures described in this section. In making this decision the head officer shall consider information gathered from student evaluations of teaching, evidence gathered from any class visitations and the results of previous evaluations. The head officer shall report the decision to the dean. Unless the head officer or the dean calls for a full review, the process shall proceed under the procedures described in this section.
- c. The evaluatee shall prepare a file as described in Chapter III, section 4 a and submit it to the head officer.
- d. After reviewing the file the head officer shall write a letter of evaluation and forward the file and letter to the dean. The dean shall write a letter of evaluation and forward it to the head officer. Copies of both letters shall be forwarded to the evaluatee.
- e. At the conclusion of this review process, the evaluatee, the head officer or the dean may call for a full review under the procedures of Chapter III section 4 to be conducted during the subsequent academic year. In such a case the faculty evaluatee shall prepare a file as described in Chapter III, section 4a. The head officer shall add to this file, for departmental review, all of the materials from the previous file, including the evaluation letters of the head officer and the dean.
- f. Evaluations conducted under the procedures described in the section are not subject to the process described in Chapter III section 6 and may not be appealed.
- g. No evaluation conducted under the procedures described in this section may be used in a determination of adequate cause for dismissal as described in Chapter II, section a (1).

**Date:** April 2, 2003  
**To:** Faculty Senate  
**From:** Professional Standards Committee  
**Subject:** Report on ways to streamline the evaluation process

One of the PSC's charges for 2002-2003 was to "Investigate ways to streamline the evaluation process." This memo provides the results of the committee's investigation.

The memo contains two parts. The first part presents the general conclusions of the PSC's investigation, i.e. what we would like to see changed with respect to the faculty evaluation process. Since these changes would require an amendment to the Faculty Code, the second part of the memo contains one possible wording for the prospective amendment.

First, some remarks about how we view the problem that "streamlining the evaluation process" is intended to address. We are mostly concerned with lessening the burden on department evaluators and the FAC, but we hope our proposal also eases somewhat the workload of the head officer and the dean. We also consider the evaluation process specified by the Faculty Code to be fundamentally sound, effective, and fair. Our suggestions only concern streamlining the process in order to make it more efficient, and do not involve any fundamental change in the way that faculty are evaluated at the University of Puget Sound.

The PSC proposes revising the evaluation process at two different levels: 3-year associate and 5-year full professor. The changes would only apply to 3-year associate evaluations that do not also involve a tenure decision. We propose that 3-year associate reviews and every other 5-year full professor evaluation be conducted by the head officer and the dean unless any one of the three parties (the evaluatee, head officer, or dean) requests a complete FAC evaluation. Thus for associate professors who received tenure at the time of promotion, the third year associate professor evaluation would not normally involve the FAC or the president; this would also be the case for the full professor evaluations that take place in years 5, 15, 25, and so forth. The one case where this option would not be available is where the faculty member's last evaluation was unsatisfactory; in that case a standard full FAC evaluation would be mandatory.

We propose that the evaluation process for these faculty members take place in the following way. The faculty member being evaluated will consult with the head officer prior to the evaluation to decide if a full FAC evaluation is desired by either party. Assuming that both decline the opportunity to involve the FAC, the dean will be informed of the decision. At this point the dean could either concur with the decision of the evaluatee and head officer, or request a full evaluation. The decision of the evaluatee, the head officer, and the dean should be made sufficiently early in the evaluation process to allow for scheduling class visitations. Assuming that none of the three parties requests a FAC evaluation, the faculty member will prepare a file containing the relevant materials on teaching, scholarship, and service. The head officer will review the materials in the file and write a letter of evaluation. A copy of this letter will be given to the evaluatee and the letter (along with the file) will be forwarded to the dean. The dean will examine the file and prepare an evaluation letter. The dean's evaluation letter being sent to the head officer and the faculty member will end the evaluation process. If at the end of this process the evaluatee, the head officer, or the dean desires a full FAC evaluation, it shall occur along with the scheduled evaluations during the following year. The only stipulation is that the new file for the following year must include all of the materials from the previous year's file as well as the letters from both the head officer and the dean. With this one stipulation, the evaluation process will begin again in the following year under the conditions currently specified by the Faculty Code. Since a full review in the following year is a possibility, the entire evaluation process should be completed in sufficient time to schedule class visitations and prepare an evaluation file for the following year according to the relevant departmental guidelines.

We believe that such changes would improve the efficiency of the 3-year associate and 5-year full professor reviews while maintaining the strength and integrity of the current evaluation process. These changes provide an adequate number of "escape clauses" for all parties (with the current evaluation process as the default) while also providing the opportunity for an expedited, yet effective and fair, evaluation of faculty within the confines of our existing evaluative procedures and institutions.