

Professional Standards Committee 2015-16 Year-End Report

Committee Members: Kris Bartanen, Geoffrey Block (Spring), Tiffany MacBain, Garrett Milam, Jennifer Neighbors, Amy Odegard (Fall), Mark Reinitz (Chair), Kurt Walls, and Matt Warning

Below is the list of charges issued to PSC in 2015-16 with a report of the work completed by the PSC in relation to each charge. Additional work carried out by the committee is described in a subsequent section.

I. Charges and Work Completed

Faculty senate had 5 charges for PSC. These are listed below along with the rationale for each and a summary of work done by the committee.

Charge: *Review interpretations of the Faculty Code begun in Academic Year 2014-2015 yet to be evaluated by the Title IX work group.*

Rationale: This was a self-charge from the 2014-15 year-end report. That committee had been charged with reviewing all code interpretations to ensure that they were consistent with contemporary language use and culture. Reviews of interpretations that had Title IX implications were delayed pending a review by the Title IX work group.

Report: The committee reviewed wording changes to *Faculty Code* interpretations proposed by the Title IX workgroup, following review by university counsel, to ensure that the *Faculty Code* aligns with Title IX requirements. As part of this review it was necessary to compare those interpretations with the Campus Policy Prohibiting Harassment and Sexual Misconduct in order to ensure that the *Faculty Code* and the policy aligned.

During this review it became clear to the committee that there is ambiguity in the current Campus Policy Prohibiting Harassment and Sexual Misconduct regarding consensual sexual relationships between faculty and students, and that similar ambiguity exists in an active *Faculty Code* Interpretation (*Chapter 1, Part C, Section 3, Chapter 1, Part D, Section 2 (e), and Chapter 1, Part D, Section 4 Professional ethics of faculty and relationships of a sexual nature*). Both the Policy and the Code Interpretation explicitly forbid sexual relationships between students and faculty members whenever that faculty member "...is currently or potentially in a position to make or influence a decision or to confer or withhold a benefit relating to the student's education or employment." At the same time, the documents state that "A consensual sexual relationship between a faculty or staff member and a student does not necessarily involve sexual harassment or misconduct." Committee members noted that these statements are potentially contradictory because all faculty members have the potential to negatively impact students in the ways

described above, and agreed that this ambiguity potentially puts students at risk and exposes the University to possible lawsuits.

This issue was the focus of several PSC meetings. To inform the discussion Alisa Kessel (Associate Professor of Politics and Government) and Michael Benitez (Dean for Diversity and Inclusion/Chief Diversity Officer) were both invited guests at meetings where they facilitated conversations regarding power inequities, Title IX rules and trending changes, and other relevant issues. Finally the PSC crafted proposed wording changes to the Campus Policy document, intended to eliminate ambiguity, that explicitly forbid any sexual and/or romantic relationship between a faculty member and a student. The proposed wording is included in Appendix A along with the current wording for comparison. The wording changes were presented by PSC members Mark Reinitz and Jennifer Neighbors at the February 8, 2016 Faculty Senate Meeting. Following discussion of the rationale for the change the Senate voted to endorse the proposed change.

Consistent with our work on the campus Policy document described above, the PSC approved wording changes to *Faculty Code Interpretation of Chapter 1, Part C, Section 3, Chapter 1, Part D, Section 2 (e), and Chapter 1, Part D, Section 4, Professional ethics of faculty and relationships of a sexual nature* that clarify that a sexual and/or romantic relationship between a faculty member and a student is not permitted by the code.

The other outstanding Interpretation to be reviewed was to *Chapter VI, Grievances arising from allegations of sexual harassment*. Changes to this interpretation include replacing definitions (e.g., of harassment) with references to relevant documents, replacing the list of people to whom harassment may be reported (which was obsolete) with a hyperlink to “harassment response officers,” and replacing verbiage to align the interpretation with Title IX requirements and with our recommended change to the Campus Policy Prohibiting Harassment and Sexual Misconduct regarding sexual and /or romantic relationships between a faculty member and a student.

The changes are included in Appendix B which also includes the current wording for comparison. The committee discussed whether these constituted significant Code interpretations. The committee voted to wait until the new Campus Policy Prohibiting Discriminatory Harassment and Sexual Misconduct was finalized before sending the Interpretation forward, concluding that this would not be a significant interpretation if it merely restated existing campus policy.

Charge: *Review the line on pages 22-24 of page 11 of the Faculty Code (Chapter 3, Section 3 (e)), which states, "Advancement to the rank of full professor is contingent upon evidence of distinguished service in addition to sustained growth in the above-mentioned areas." The wording of this sentence can be interpreted in two ways: either the candidate's teaching, professional growth, service, advising, etc., must be distinguished, or their performance in the*

category of service to the university and community in particular must be distinguished. This ambiguity is potentially a big problem with high-stakes consequences. It would be great if the PSC (and the faculty as a whole) could revise the Code to remove the ambiguity.

Rationale: The ambiguity in the code passage may mean that people in different departments are evaluated using different criteria depending on how a given department interprets the passage. Moreover, a letter to PSC written by three faculty members argued that outstanding professional growth should be the most relevant factor in promotion to full professor, and that the second interpretation leads to a reduction in professional growth so that faculty can meet the distinguished service criterion.

Report: In collaboration with Ellen Peters (Institutional Research) the committee created a survey for Chairs, Directors, and Deans to determine whether there was consensus on how the passage is interpreted, and on whether the expectation of distinguished service is in the best interest of the University. The survey is included in Appendix C along with a summary of the results. There was a broad diversity of interpretations and opinions regarding the passage. Given this lack of consistency the committee tried but failed to establish “legislative intent” by reviewing PSC minutes from when the passage was added to the code. Given the differing interpretations both within the committee and in the broader University community, committee members felt that prior to a campus-wide discussion of what faculty mean by the “distinguished service” phrase, any interpretation made by the committee would be arbitrary.

Charge: *Consider whether students with accessibility hardships might be granted extended time in which to fill out evaluations of courses and instructors.*

Rationale: This charge is based in concern that students with accessibility hardships may have insufficient time to complete course evaluations.

Report: The committee discussed this and concurred to have Dean Bartanen contact Peggy Perno and develop a plan to allow students with disabilities more time.

Charge: *The faculty senate charged the committee with exploring the advisability of a cycle of review for department and program faculty evaluation standards and criteria.*

Rationale: The PSC asked to be issued this charge in its year-end report. At present, there is no cycle or timeline for the revision of said evaluation standards and criteria.

Report: The status quo is that departmental guidelines generally come up for review on an *ad hoc* basis, sometimes in response to changes in the *Faculty Code*, but also in response to changing priorities in departments. The discussion centered on whether there was a need for a fixed review process, and on the mechanics of such a process if one were created. The committee agreed that if a schedule were put in place it should be rolling to spread the committee workload, and that departments

should perhaps be given the option of “no change” rather than going through a full review. Committee members were supportive of the idea of a review cycle for departmental guidelines but chose to table the issue until other questions, including the ambiguity of language in the university guidelines regarding the question of distinguished service and sustained growth, are resolved.

Charge: *Assay studies of biases to which students’ evaluations of teaching are prone and to recommend to faculty those studies, if any, that should inform faculty discussion of biases in students’ evaluations.”*

Rationale: Faculty may be evaluated differently for the same performance because of biases, leading to inequity.

Report: PSC members did not feel that they had adequate background to assess specific articles on the topic of evaluation bias. We did a preliminary internet search that led us to conclude that issues of bias were real with regard to faculty evaluations, and that both women and members of minoritized groups tended to receive lower ratings than white men did for similar work. A link to a review article about evaluation bias provided to the committee by Dean Bartanen is included in Appendix D along with a link to a recent article that all of the committee members read in preparation for our discussion. The committee took up this change relatively late in the academic year and felt that any specific recommendations from the committee would be based in insufficient consideration and implemented in haste. Julie Nelson Christoph (Professor of English) was a guest at a PSC meeting devoted to this charge. She is part of a campus work group that has been meeting to explore issues of gender bias in evaluations. In our discussion Professor Christoph suggested a campus-wide effort for inclusive discussion and education regarding these issues. Within this discussion it was suggested that faculty evaluators be directed to familiarize themselves with the state of current research regarding gender bias. It was noted that another possible approach would be to include training regarding gender bias in mandated Title IX sexual harassment training. Finally, a committee member proposed perhaps a role analogous to that of the diversity liaison in faculty search processes might be created within faculty reviewers to address gender bias. While these recommendations are outside our purview, PSC welcomes proposals (for instance, to include text relevant to evaluation bias in the Faculty Evaluation Procedures and Criteria [“Buff”] Document) that it may act upon in order to reduce bias in evaluations.

II. Other Business

In addition to taking up formal charges, the PSC attended to other matters during AY2015-16:

1. We reviewed and recommended minor changes to the start of year letter to department chairs detailing how to process course evaluations.

2. The committee reviewed, commented on, and approved Faculty Evaluation Guidelines from the Art and Art History, Biology, and Philosophy departments. We also reviewed and approved Course Assistant guidelines from Occupational Therapy.
3. We reviewed the new “Campus Animal Control Policy” document. We recommended wording changes and also recommended that the document be sent to Faculty Senate for consideration because of the potential impact of the policy on some faculty members.
4. We discussed a request from Physical Therapy for trial electronic course evaluations. This request was approved with three conditions: paper copies of the evaluation must be available in case of computer issues; the paper versions must be identical to the electronic form; and PT is to provide a report of their evaluation experience afterwards.
5. We responded to an inquiry about whether a faculty member can refer to information that is not part of an evaluatee’s file (in this case an on-line study guide) when writing an evaluation letter. One member drew attention to several code passages indicating that all evaluators should have access to the same information, while another pointed out a code passage indicating that evaluation of an evaluatee’s professional development is to be based on their objectives and philosophy *both* as outlined in the file *and* as demonstrated in practice. The key tension in the discussion centered around faculty members potentially misrepresenting their work on one hand by selectively omitting potentially important information, and by an unfriendly evaluator “fishing” for negative information on the other. Committee members agreed that there were checks and balances in place to help prevent these outcomes, and decided 1) to continue (for now) to allow individual departments to determine standard practice, and 2) to inform the Faculty Senate that there is a potential problem with the articulation of evaluation procedures in the *Faculty Code*.

The charges that the PSC asks to be issued in the 2016-17 AY are:

- Review the University Evaluation Standards (which constitute the bulk of the “Buff” Faculty Evaluation Procedures and Criteria document) for currency and consistency with recent code interpretations (these standards were last revised in 5/99).
- Develop a policy or set of guidelines for course/faculty evaluation of team-taught courses.
- Review whether streamlined reviews should have associated “streamlined files” that do not tempt evaluatees to include all teaching materials, links to all Moodle files, etc.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of the PSC,

Mark Reinitz, Chair

APPENDIX A

PSC proposal for a new section for the Campus Policy Prohibiting Harassment and Sexual Misconduct, to fall after Part II Section E and to replace the second paragraph of the current Part II Section E:

Relationships Between Faculty and Students (Proposed version)

The pedagogical relationship between faculty and students is one that entrusts the faculty member with guiding and shaping a student's academic and oftentimes personal development. Power inequalities between faculty members and students are inherent in such a situation. For example, faculty members have the power to make or influence decisions that may affect a student's education, financial aid, graduate school opportunities, current and future employment, and overall ability to succeed in his or her time at college.

As a result, the ability for a student to give full and affirmative consent to a sexual and/or romantic relationship with a faculty member can be diminished or compromised. In addition to the potential harm such relationships can inflict on the student, such relationships have the potential to create a negative environment for other individuals who may perceive that they are disadvantaged as a result of the relationship. Consequently, the University of Puget Sound prohibits any sexual and/or romantic relationship between a faculty member and a student. *All reported violations of this policy will be investigated. If it is determined that a violation has occurred, the faculty member will be subject¹ to disciplinary action and possible dismissal.*

The university recognizes that in some cases the spouse or partner of a faculty member may enroll in classes at the university. If such relationships are disclosed to the university's Title IX Coordinator prior to the student's enrollment, those relationships are exempt from this prohibition. However, the faculty member in such a situation is required to ensure that he/she/they recuses himself/herself/themselves from any grading or administrative decision-making processes in which the student is involved. For further information on procedures regarding spouses and partners enrolled at the university, see the Professional Standards Committee's interpretation of Chapter I, Part C, Section 2 and Chapter I, Part D, Section 4 of the Faculty Code, found in the Faculty Code's Appendix.

¹ Language in italics is taken almost verbatim from Connecticut College's "Consensual Sexual Relations Policy."

Campus Policy Prohibiting Harassment and Sexual Misconduct (current version):

Part II Section E: Consensual Sexual Relationships

Consent is defined as verbal agreement and positive physical cooperation in the course of mutually agreed upon sexual activity. The person giving consent must act freely, voluntarily and understand the nature of consent. Consent may not be given by a minor or by a person who suffers from mental incompetence or intoxication. Lack of protest or silence does not imply consent. The person who wants to engage in the specific sexual activity or conduct is responsible for obtaining consent to make sure that he or she has consent from the other party(ies). A prior relationship is not sufficient to indicate consent. Consent must be present throughout and can be revoked at any time.

A consensual sexual relationship between a faculty or staff member and a student does not necessarily involve sexual harassment or misconduct. However, the university's educational responsibilities to its students are potentially compromised in all such cases by the likelihood or even the appearance of a conflict of interests. Consequently, this policy prohibits consensual sexual relationships between a faculty or staff member and a student whenever the faculty or staff member is in a position of professional responsibility with respect to the student. A faculty or staff member has a professional responsibility when he or she is currently or potentially in a position to make or influence a decision or to confer or withhold a benefit relating to the student's education or employment.

In accord with the university's conflict of interest provisions, this policy prohibits faculty or staff members from exercising supervisory responsibility with respect to another faculty or staff member with whom they are involved in a consensual sexual relationship. A faculty or staff member who enters into a consensual sexual relationship with a subordinate is required to promptly disclose the relationship to his/her superior(s) so that reassignment, alternative supervision processes, or other arrangements can be facilitated and documented.

APPENDIX B

Wording changes to code interpretations to go forward after approval of the Campus Policy Prohibiting Discriminatory Harassment and Sexual Misconduct

Current	Proposed 9/17/15 and 4/19/15
<p>Interpretations of the Faculty Code related to Title IX</p> <p>CHAPTER I Interpretation of Chapter I, Part C, Section 2, and Chapter I, Part D, Section 4. Professional Ethics of Faculty and Relationships of a Sexual Nature (Report to Faculty Senate 18 April 1984; Revised May 2015): Current</p> <p>In those cases where the faculty member is in a position of professional responsibility with respect to the student, the Professional Standards Committee rules that sexual relationships violate acceptable standards of professional ethics as required by the <i>Faculty Code</i>, Chapter I, Part D, Section 4 and impair the role of teacher as defined in Chapter I, Part C, Section 2. This policy aligns with the university’s conflict of interest provisions in the <i>Code of Conduct</i> as well as Section II, Part E (“Consensual Sexual Relationship”) of the <i>Campus Policy Prohibiting Harassment and Sexual Misconduct</i>.</p> <p>Interpretation of Chapter I, Part C, Section 3, Chapter 1, Part D, Section 2 (e), and Chapter I, Part D, Section 4. Professional Ethics of Faculty and Relationships of a Consensual Sexual Nature. (Approved by the Professional Standards Committee, February 18, 2013; Revised May 2015): Current</p> <p>It is in the best interest of the university and all individuals associated with the university that there be no real or perceived bias in situations where one individual exerts influence over another colleague or staff member. Situations of direct supervision or when one has the ability to advance, promote, recommend, or in any other</p>	<p>Interpretations of the Faculty Code related to Title IX</p> <p>CHAPTER I Interpretation of Chapter I, Part C, Section 2, and Chapter I, Part D, Section 4. Professional Ethics of Faculty and Relationships of a Sexual Nature (Report to Faculty Senate 18 April 1984; Revised May 2015): Current</p> <p><u>A sexual and/or romantic relationship between a faculty member and a student</u> violates acceptable standards of professional ethics as required by the <i>Faculty Code</i>, Chapter 1, Part D, Section 4 and impairs the role of teacher as defined in Chapter 1, Part, C, Section. 2. This policy aligns with the university’s conflict of interest provisions in the <i>Code of Conduct</i> as well as Section II, Part E (“Consensual Sexual Relationship”) of the <i>Campus Policy Prohibiting Harassment and Sexually Misconduct</i>.</p> <p>Interpretation of Chapter I, Part C, Section 3, Chapter 1, Part D, Section 2 (e), and Chapter I, Part D, Section 4. Professional Ethics of Faculty and Relationships of a Consensual Sexual Nature. (Approved by the Professional Standards Committee, February 18, 2013; Revised May 2015): Current</p> <p>It is in the best interest of the university and all individuals associated with the university that there be no real or perceived bias in situations where one individual exerts influence over another colleague or staff member. Situations of direct supervision or when one has the ability to advance, promote, recommend, or in any other</p>

<p>way directly influence the academic or work status of the colleague are the times when transparency is required.</p> <p>The existence of a consensual sexual relationship constitutes a conflict of interest, and can create a real or perceived bias. Therefore, it is the policy of the university that such relationships should be disclosed when there is any possibility of a supervisory or career influencing role between the parties. When faculty or staff members enter into a consensual sexual relationship where one party has supervisory or career influence over the other, each party is required to promptly disclose the relationship to his/her superior(s) so that reassignment, alternative supervision processes, or other arrangements can be facilitated and documented.</p> <p>The following scenarios are presented as examples where a faculty member must disclose the existence of a consensual sexual relationship. They are not intended to be exclusive, and faculty members should exercise judgment when faced with a similar situation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The evaluation process is clearly career-influencing. No faculty member should participate in the evaluation of another faculty member with whom he or she is involved in a consensual sexual relationship and all faculty members, including head officers, are expected to recuse themselves from such situations. • Hiring decisions are also understood to involve the exercise of judgment and may result in a work- or career-influencing relationship. No faculty member should participate in the search or hiring process when a person with whom he or she is involved in a consensual sexual relationship is an applicant and all faculty members, including head officers, are expected to recuse themselves from such situations. • The responsibilities of serving as department chair or program director may also, at times, require supervising or making decisions about the academic or work status of other departmental 	<p>way directly influence the academic or work status of the colleague are the times when transparency is required.</p> <p>The existence of a consensual sexual relationship constitutes a conflict of interest, and can create a real or perceived bias. Therefore, it is the policy of the university that such relationships should be disclosed when there is any possibility of a supervisory or career influencing role between the parties. When faculty or staff members enter into a consensual sexual relationship where one party has supervisory or career influence over the other, each party is required to promptly disclose the relationship to his/her superior(s) so that reassignment, alternative supervision processes, or other arrangements can be facilitated and documented.</p> <p>The following scenarios are presented as examples where a faculty member must disclose the existence of a consensual sexual relationship. They are not intended to be exclusive, and faculty members should exercise judgment when faced with a similar situation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The evaluation process is clearly career-influencing. No faculty member should participate in the evaluation of another faculty member with whom he or she is involved in a consensual sexual relationship and all faculty members, including head officers, are expected to recuse themselves from such situations. • Hiring decisions are also understood to involve the exercise of judgment and may result in a work- or career-influencing relationship. No faculty member should participate in the search or hiring process when a person with whom he or she is involved in a consensual sexual relationship is an applicant and all faculty members, including head officers, are expected to recuse themselves from such situations. • The responsibilities of serving as department chair or program director may also, at times, require supervising or making decisions about the academic or work status of other departmental
---	---

members. Departmental chairs should be aware of when their duties place them in a career-influencing relationship to a colleague with whom they are involved in a consensual sexual relationship. If and when such situations should arise, chairs should take care to put alternative processes in place to avoid conflicts of interest or other improprieties.

This policy aligns with the university's conflict of interest provisions in the *Code of Conduct* as well as Section II, Part E ("Consensual Sexual Relationship") of the *Campus Policy Prohibiting Harassment and Sexual Misconduct*.

If you have concerns regarding obligations under this policy, please refer to Chapter 1, Part D, Section 4 of the *Faculty Code* ("Professional Ethics"), and/or speak with your head of department, school, or program or the Academic Vice President.

CHAPTER VI

Interpretation of Chapter VI. Grievances arising from allegations of sexual harassment. (Sexual Harassment Policy adopted by Faculty Senate 17 January 1983): Current

The University of Puget Sound reaffirms the principle that its students, faculty, and staff have a right to be free from sex discrimination in the form of sexual harassment by any member of the academic community.

Sexual harassment is defined as actions intended to coerce an unwilling person into a sexual relationship, to subject a person to unwanted sexual advances, to punish a refusal to comply with such intentions or to create a sexually intimidating or hostile working or educational environment. This definition will be interpreted and applied consistent with accepted standards of mature behavior, academic freedom, and freedom of expression.

members. Departmental chairs should be aware of when their duties place them in a career-influencing relationship to a colleague with whom they are involved in a consensual sexual relationship. If and when such situations should arise, chairs should take care to put alternative processes in place to avoid conflicts of interest or other improprieties.

This policy aligns with the university's conflict of interest provisions in the *Code of Conduct* as well as Section II, Part E ("Consensual Sexual Relationship") of the *Campus Policy Prohibiting Harassment and Sexual Misconduct*.

If you have concerns regarding obligations under this policy, please refer to Chapter 1, Part D, Section 4 of the *Faculty Code* ("Professional Ethics"), and/or speak with your head of department, school, or program or the Academic Vice President.

CHAPTER VI

Interpretation of Chapter VI. Grievances arising from allegations of discriminatory harassment, sexual misconduct, and prohibited sexual and/or romantic relationships. (Sexual Harassment Policy adopted by Faculty Senate 17 January 1983; interpretation updated to align with the Campus Policy Prohibiting Harassment and Sexual Misconduct, DATE)

The University of Puget Sound prohibits discriminatory harassment, including sexual harassment, and sexual misconduct by any member of the university community. The university also prohibits any sexual and/or romantic relationships between a faculty member and student.

Details on these prohibitions can be found in Part II of the Campus Policy Prohibiting Harassment and Sexual Misconduct.

These definitions will be interpreted and applied consistent with principles of academic freedom (as detailed in the Faculty Code, Chapter I, Part E) and acceptable standards of reasonable behavior.

<p>Situations believed to involve sexual harassment may be discussed in confidence with the Director of Human Resources and Affirmative Action, the Dean of Students, the Dean of the University, or any member of the above named staffs.</p> <p>If the complaint requires a formal or informal hearing, the appropriate procedures of the <i>Academic Handbook</i>, the <i>Faculty Code</i>, the <i>Personnel Policies and Procedures Manual</i>, or the <i>Student Conduct Code</i> may be applied.</p> <p>Complaints about sexual harassment will be responded to promptly and equitably. University policy explicitly prohibits retaliation against individuals for bringing complaints of sexual harassment. Formal procedures will not be initiated without a written, signed complaint. An individual found to be guilty of sexual harassment is subject to disciplinary action for violations of this policy, consistent with existing procedures.</p>	<p>Situations believed to involve <u>discriminatory harassment, sexual misconduct, and prohibited sexual and/or romantic relationships</u> may be <u>discussed with Harassment Response Officers. For further information on members of the university who serve as Harassment Response Officers and for information on complaint procedures, consult Part IV of the Campus Policy Prohibiting Harassment and Sexual Misconduct.</u></p> <p>If the complaint requires a hearing, the appropriate procedures of the <i>Academic Handbook</i>, the <i>Faculty Code</i>, the <i>Staff Policies and Procedures Manual</i>, and/or the <i>Student Conduct Code</i> may be applied.</p> <p>Complaints about <u>discriminatory harassment, sexual misconduct, and prohibited sexual and/or romantic relationships</u> will be responded to promptly and equitably. University policy explicitly prohibits retaliation against individuals for bringing <u>such</u> complaints.</p> <p>Formal procedures will not be initiated without a written, signed complaint. <u>A formal complaint against a faculty member will be adjudicated pursuant to the grievance procedures of Chapter VI or the dismissal procedures of Chapter V of the Faculty Code. Violations of the Campus Policy Prohibiting Harassment and Sexual Misconduct are a breach of contract of employment with reference to the applicable substantive provisions of Chapter I of the Faculty Code, and will result in disciplinary action and possible dismissal.</u></p>
---	--

APPENDIX C

1. Text of survey regarding interpretation of the “distinguished service” criterion for advancement to Full Professor.

The Professional Standards Committee has been charged by the Faculty Senate to review Chapter III, Section 3.e. of the Faculty Code, which states: “Faculty promotion shall be based upon the quality of a person’s performance of academic duties. Specifically, decisions whether to promote shall be based upon the quality of the faculty member’s performance in the following areas, listed in order of importance: (1) teaching; (2) professional growth; (3) advising students; (4) participation in university service; and (5) community service related to professional interests and expertise. Because the university seeks the highest standards for faculty advancement, mere satisfactory performance is no guarantee of promotion. In addition, appointment to the rank of associate professor and professor normally requires a doctoral, or other equivalent terminal degree. Advancement to the rank of full professor is contingent upon evidence of distinguished service in addition to sustained growth in the above-mentioned areas.”

Q1: How does your department, school, or program interpret the Faculty Code passage on advancement to Professor?

[open comment box]

Q2: In the event that the PSC decides to issue a significant interpretation of the Faculty Code to clarify this passage, which of the following do you believe would best serve the long-term strength of the Puget Sound faculty?

(a) The expectation articulated by the Faculty Code is that “evidence of distinguished service” refers to distinguished university service (i.e., category 4 in the list of areas), which is considered separately from sustained growth in all five areas of review.

(b) The expectation articulated by the Faculty Code is there is evidence of “distinguished service and sustained growth” across the five areas of evaluation.

(c) A different expectation than either of the above (please describe): [open comment box]

Q3. Regardless of your answer to question 2, do you feel that emphasis on distinguished service is appropriate for promotion to Professor? Why or why not?

2. Summary of Survey Results

Question 1: How does your department, school, or program interpret the bolded Faculty Code passage on advancement to Professor?

Distinguished University Service: 7

No interpretation (varies between reviews): 4

No definition provided (other to say that service is required): 8

Service across multiple areas: 5

No idea how it should be interpreted: 1

Question 2: In the event that the PSC decides to issue a significant interpretation of the Faculty Code to clarify this passage, which of the following do you believe would best serve the long-term strength of the Puget Sound faculty?

University Service: 14

Service in all 5 areas: 7

Focus should be on teaching and professional development: 4

Question 3: Regardless of your answer to the above question, does your department, school or program feel that emphasis on distinguished service is appropriate for promotion to Professor? Why or why not?

Yes: 11

No: 7

Yes but it should be no more important than any other area: 4

No opinion: 3

APPENDIX D

LINKS TO ARTICLES REVIEWED BY PSC ABOUT BIAS IN STUDENT EVALUATIONS

1. Review article provided by Dean Bartanen:

Benton, S. L., & Cashin, W. E. (2012). IDEA PAPER# 50 Student Ratings of Teaching: A Summary of Research and Literature.

This may be accessed at:

<http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download;jsessionid=25CB836BE3D6CFCC7D77463BE3F6C510?doi=10.1.1.388.8561&rep=rep1&type=pdf>

2. Recent relevant article from Inside Higher Ed:

<https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2016/01/11/new-analysis-offers-more-evidence-against-student-evaluations-teaching>