

**University of Puget Sound
Faculty Meeting Minutes
October 13, 2003**

1. President Thomas called the meeting to order at 4:09 p.m. in McIntyre 103. Thirty-five voting members of the faculty were present by 4:45.
2. Minutes of the September 9, 2003 faculty meeting were approved as distributed.
3. In response to President Thomas's call for announcements, Bill Beardsley reminded us of the Faculty Club party tomorrow, October 14th, at 4:00 p.m. in the clubhouse.
4. President Thomas reported that he continues to meet with faculty, staff, and student groups, and that he has so far met with every department in the college, allowing every employee the opportunity to have conversation with him. He said he is also meeting with students and off-campus groups of alumni and friends. He said he is learning a great deal about the hopes and aspirations that these people have for the college and that he detects in them a great deal of affection and admiration for the University of Puget Sound.

President Thomas reported that over 100 alums attended the first Alumni Club event of the year three weeks ago in Denver. More such events will be held later this semester in Tacoma and Seattle. He reported that, despite slightly lower alumni attendance than hoped for, Homecoming this past weekend was successful in terms of the spirit and strong sense of expectation that participants displayed. He thanked those faculty who attended the reception at his house Friday night, saying that the alums very much appreciated it.

President Thomas reported on the recent working retreat of the Board of Trustees. He said he shared with trustees the data and items of concern he had discussed with faculty at the fall faculty conversation. He said he outlined the challenges we will face in terms of competition for students, finance, and successfully promoting the university. He said Board members were well engaged on these issues.

President Thomas said he had reported to the Board that despite being very close to the new freshman recruitment target for this fall (641 enrolled vs. a target of 650), the shortfall in combination with slightly disappointing student retention leaves us with a potential budget shortfall for the year that we will address. President Thomas went on to emphasize the importance of the faculty role in recruiting which, he said, is an institution-wide effort, not just the responsibility of the admissions' staff and the coaches. He said he has asked Deans Bartanen and Cooney to propose a second-year initiative that will explain where and why we are losing students and what we can do about it. He said our Freshman Advising Program serves freshmen well and by the junior year students are "ensconced" in their majors, but the sophomore year "is a kind of valley year that we need to work to define as a critical part of the student's career." He said we need to get to these students before they get into trouble in an effort to complement the work of the Student Alert Group, which works with students after they have become attrition risks.

President Thomas thanked faculty who were a part of the Thursday evening entertainment during the Board meeting to educate the Board about the new science building. He thanked Tom Rowland, Rob Beezer, Betsy Kirkpatrick, and Alan Thorndike. He said this was a huge success and that it stimulated much interest in the project.

President Thomas reported on the master planning workshop held for Board members, at which were introduced the SRG architectural firm, the landscaping architect, Walker Macy, and Lee Copeland from the University of Washington, a nationally recognized master planner who is serving us in an advisory capacity.

President Thomas said that he had spent the hour prior to this meeting with the Diversity Committee discussing the blackface incident on campus last week. He said that one of our strategic objectives is to create a diverse community that is welcoming of a broad range of our society and that incidents like last week's "do not advance that agenda." He said addressing the issue should be something we do as educators, especially since the incident occurred out of the ignorance of the students involved, by their own report. He said he was proud of the students for their apology. At the same time he urged us to be proactive in working to realize the full scope of our ambitions and values, saying it is our responsibility to do so. He thanked David Macey who chaired the Diversity committee.

5. Dean Terry Cooney reminded us of the session tomorrow at 4:30 p.m. in the Boardroom at which we will have the opportunity to view the latest iteration of the viewbook under development. He also acknowledged the great amount of work that science faculty have contributed to the Howard Hughes Medical Institute grant application being coordinated by Liz Collins.

Before moving on to the next agenda item David Scott asked by how much student retention was down this year. John Finney responded that the long-term student retention trend appears still to be upward, but that upward movement occurs in fits and starts from year to year. This year retention dipped a bit from last year. This, combined with the shortfall in new students, caused actual enrollment to be slightly below the number on which the budget is based.

6. Faculty Senate Chair Bill Beardsley had no report.
7. We turned to the main agenda item, the second reading and discussion 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 the September 9, 2003 faculty meeting. Hard copies were available at today's meeting.

Beardsley M/S "approval of the amendment to Chapter III, section 5 [insert between 4 and 5, renumber old section 5] of the Faculty Code." President Thomas reminded us that the proposal had its required first reading at our last meeting on September 9, 2003.

Bill Haltom M/S/ "to amend the proposed amendment by replacing the word 'choosing' with 'who are eligible and choose' in part 'b.'" The motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

Haltom M/S "to amend the proposed amendment by adding 'Selection of a mode of review will neither presume nor preclude any assessments as to the merits of the file.' as the fourth sentence in part 'b.'" Haltom explained the rationale for his motion by pointing out that an abbreviated evaluation could yield any number of outcomes, and that the added wording makes it clear that if the head officer does not accede to the evaluatee's request for an abbreviated review there is no implication that can be drawn from that about the merits of the file. The motion passed on a unanimous voice vote.

Julian Edgoose M/S "to amend section 'c' of the proposed amendment to read 'The evaluatee shall prepare a file as described in Chapter III, section 4a and submit it to his or her department one month before the review date. All departmental colleagues eligible to participate in evaluations, under standards approved by the Professional Standards Committee under Chapter III, section 3b of the Faculty Code, will have the option of reviewing the file.'" Edgoose argued that the motion maintains the openness of the review process by allowing faculty to see what their colleagues are doing; it helps to preserve openness by removing any suspicions that senior colleagues may be passed through "on the quiet;" and it reduces any apparent discrepancy between abbreviated and full evaluations.

David Tinsley argued that one of the current system's strengths is that it is anchored at the department level and that all department members can participate fully. He said this guarantees as open a process as possible. He wants to avoid the situation of a head officer/dean determination

being reached in opposition to the entire department. He said the motion preserves the right of all members of the department to be involved.

Florence Sandler asked what kind of procedure there might be for colleagues actually reviewing the file to write letters contrary to the assessment of the head officer. Edgoose responded that we can't start recreating the entire evaluation process all over again within an abbreviated framework. Tinsley added that it is difficult to decide what would be the status of these letters; where they would fit in and whether there would be any opportunity to respond. He said the implication of Sandler's question is that all of the issues involved in a full review would have to be dealt with in the abbreviated review process.

Keith Ward asked if there would still be a single letter from the department head. Edgoose responded that the motion just makes it possible for department members to read the file to judge it for themselves, but that it does not create a mechanism for other letters to be included.

Kris Bartanen asked what would happen if there was dissent between the department head and department colleagues. Does the process continue as described under the abbreviated process or does it become a full process? Tinsley said that under the proposal for an abbreviated review process the department is not included among those parties who can make a full review happen, and that under the current motion to amend the proposal members of the department are not getting any power except to read the file.

Beardsley spoke in support of the motion and argued that the kind of "transparency" it makes possible is in itself quite powerful.

Derek Buescher suggested replacing the word "reviewing" with the word "reading" and Edgoose and Tinsley accepted this suggestion as a friendly amendment. The motion then became "to amend section 'c' of the proposed amendment to read 'The evaluatee shall prepare a file as described in Chapter III, section 4a and submit it to his or her department one month before the review date. All departmental colleagues eligible to participate in evaluations, under standards approved by the Professional Standards Committee under Chapter III, section 3b of the Faculty Code, will have the option of reading the file.'"

Carolyn Weisz asked if it be good to have some kind of department dissent exist "off the record." Tinsley responded that that kind of department participation is neither allowed nor mandated by the current motion. He said that under the proposed abbreviated evaluation full power for the review rests in the hands of only three people: the evaluatee, the department head, and the dean, whereas in a full review this power resides in the full department. The current motion opens the process by allowing department colleagues to inform themselves about the file if they choose; but it does not mandate or permit any action.

President Thomas asked about the one month time period in the current motion. Edgoose deferred to Dean Cooney, who pointed out that Professional Standards Committee (PSC) guidelines specify one month as the time period for presentation of the file. He said that using one month in the current motion keeps the language in line with PSC guidelines

Suzanne Barnett said opening the file for department review still does not address the problem of the absence of access to the file by extra-departmental people involved in the review process. Does it matter, she asked, if no one else in the department has expertise in the evaluatee's area? She argued that because faculty involved with interdisciplinary programs will of necessity want to involve extra-departmental colleagues in their reviews, these faculty will probably always have to opt for a full review to make it possible for extra-department colleagues to be involved.

Dean Cooney argued that the current motion is an improvement in the language of the proposed amendment because it addresses the concerns expressed in the last faculty meeting by opening up

the abbreviated review process. He said that if colleagues are in fact disenchanting, then one of the three principal parties is likely to open it up for full review.

Hans Ostrom M/S/P to end debate on the motion. The motion to end debate passed unanimously on a voice vote. The Edgoose motion then passed unanimously on a voice vote.

Barnett argued that approving the amendment for an abbreviated review process is a major step and that it would change the current culture of having junior and senior faculty involved in each other's evaluations. She said she was troubled by that. She said abbreviated reviews provide no systematic way, for example, for junior faculty to visit classes of their senior faculty colleagues. Rocchi responded by saying that under PSC guidelines class visits are supposed to be an ongoing process available to all at all times.

Ray Preiss said he didn't see how the proposed amendment streamlines things at all, since a full review can always be triggered. He said he worried about the department chair being set up for lawsuits. Dean Cooney suggested that any department chair worried about this should call for full review. He said that if the department chair doesn't want to write a negative letter under an abbreviated review, then he or she should call for a full review

Edgoose said he was concerned about the amendment as a whole. He worried that it could skew the review process so that full reviews are likely to be negative reviews and this would change the culture of the reviews and change the relationship between colleagues. He argued that we need to think about the impact on department culture. Currently full reviews are thought of as being positive experiences, whereas they could become negative ones.

Cooney responded that the idea for abbreviated reviews came from the faculty and that the PSC was as a result charged by the Faculty Senate to come up with a proposal. He reminded us that a department could decide to instruct all its chairs always to call for full reviews. He said departments should discuss their feelings about abbreviated reviews. He said that most departments have found the first associate professor review to be redundant, following so closely on the heels of the tenure review. The dilemma, he said, is the faculty is getting larger with review cycles coming around more often within departments. He said, too, that the work of the Faculty Advancement Committee is becoming close to unmanageable. The abbreviated review proposal is one way to think about getting some kind of marginal relief in those review cases that are not controversial.

Ward said the music department is faced with ten faculty reviews this year and next and that this number could be reduced by as many as three if the abbreviated review option were in place. He said he would welcome that.

Ostrom M/S/P to close debate on the proposed amendment. The motion to close debate passed on a voice vote. The motion to amend the Faculty Code then passed on a voice vote. The approved motion as amended is attached to these minutes.

There being no further business, we adjourned at 5:08 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John M. Finney
Secretary of the Faculty

Amendment to the Faculty Code Approved by Faculty October 13, 2003

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 who are eligible and choose 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. Selection of a mode of review will neither presume nor preclude any assessments as to the merits of the file. 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 4a and submit it to his or her department one month before the review date. All departmental colleagues eligible to participate in evaluations, under standards approved by the Professional Standards Committee under Chapter III, section 3b of the Faculty Code, will have the option of reading the file.
- 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).