

Professional Standards Committee 2014-15 Year-End Report

Committee Members: Kris Bartanen, Geoffrey Block, Doug Cannon, Betsy Kirkpatrick, Tiffany MacBain (chair), Andreas Madlung, Mark Reinitz, and Amy Spivey

Below is the list of charges issued to and by the PSC in 2014-15 and a report of the work completed by the PSC in relation to each charge. PSC self-charges are indicated with an asterisk (*); all other charges are Senate-initiated.

BACKGROUND CHECKS

Charge: Review policy for implementation of education verification and seven-year criminal background checks for new faculty hires.

Rationale: The PSC, in December 2013, endorsed moving ahead with these background checks. This charge follows up on that endorsement.

Report: In September 2014 Cindy Matern and Nancy Nieraeth from Human Resources presented to the PSC a proposal for expanding background checks for faculty hiring to include a social security number validation check, educational verification, and criminal background checks. The university already performs National Sex Offender Registry checks for staff and faculty, and prospective staff members are already subject to the extended background check proposed for faculty. Findings from background checks go to the Associate Vice President of Human Resources and CES (Cindy Matern), who then works with the Academic Vice President (Kris Bartanen) to determine whether or not to speak with the candidate about the results of the check and whether or not to proceed with the hire. The PSC asked questions about this decision-making process, about how the university ensures fairness if something unusual turns up during a background check, and about how the university manages the delayed completion of a degree. Following this discussion, the PSC voted unanimously to approve the policy on extended background checks for faculty hiring.

THE FACULTY CODE: INTERPRETATIONS

***Charge:** Review all of the PSC interpretations of the Faculty Code to see if any have become obsolete by more recent interpretations and to ensure consistency of all interpretations with the current practice and policies on campus.

Rationale: This was a self-charge from the 2013-14 year-end report. As a result of changing language regarding domestic partner participation in faculty evaluations the PSC discovered dated language that required updating. There are likely additional areas where language needs to be made consistent.

Report: The PSC review resulted in a number of changes to the Interpretations section of the Faculty Code, all of which are documented in the attached document that was distributed to the Faculty Senate and the Board of Trustees. (SEE APPENDIX A.) On April 20, 2015 the Faculty Senate approved minutes that included

this document and a note to alert faculty members to the changes. The 2015-16 PSC will have to complete the review of the Interpretations yet to be evaluated in the summer of 2015 by the Title IX working group.

Charge: Review the PSC “Unified interpretation of Chapter III, Sections 4, a (1) and 4, a (c). Letters of Evaluation from Persons Outside the Department” to determine if the language on outside letters should be updated for: (a) distinctions of submission process for different types of letters (e.g., letters from co-authors, mentors, reviewers; (b) processes of solicitation of letter writers; (c) dates of submission of outside letters for departmental review; (d) expectations of outside letters; and (e) any additional questions raised in PSC conversations.

Rationale: Given that different departments have different procedures and expectations for outside letters in evaluation files, a uniform process for handling letters seems in order. Additionally, the time frame of letter submission at the department level may to closely align with department deliberations to warrant sufficient integration of outside letters into departmental colleague evaluations.

Report: The document containing suggested revisions to the Interpretations of the Faculty Code addresses this charge. (SEE APPENDIX A.) With respect to the request that the PSC reconsider the requirement for a 10-day lead time on the submission of external letters to the department, the committee determined that 10 working days should be sufficient for incorporating an external letter into a review, especially if those letters could be electronically posted confidentially so that members of the review could have simultaneous access. Moreover, the committee felt that there could be negative consequences to asking for an earlier deadline, such as letter writers not having sufficient time to submit their letters.

Charge: Communicate with departments who use Course Assistants regarding the new Interpretation to Faculty Code, Chapter 1, Part C, Section 2.a. Guidelines for Course Assistants, and review revised guidelines as needed.

Rationale: The interpretation was affirmed by the Academic and Student Affairs Committee of the Board in February 2014. This charge follows up on that work in order to bring departmental CA guidelines into alignment with the interpretation.

Report: In 2013-14 the PSC revised guidelines for employing course assistants and requested materials from departments employing course assistants. Because the PSC has acted so recently on this issue, the committee decided that MacBain and Dean Bartanen would email chairs of affected departments to remind them that guidelines should be updated and brought into compliance with current guidelines. The departments that responded to the request and, consequently, whose guidelines the PSC evaluated and approved, are: Psychology, OT/PT (for OT605/PT605), Physics, and Theater Arts. On Friday, May 1, Yvonne Swinth submitted for review another set of OT guidelines. The PSC was unable to review them prior to the end of the year, so we ask that the 2015-16 PSC take up that work. In addition, next year’s PSC must renew a request for course assistant guidelines from the following

departments and then review the guidelines: Chemistry, Economics, Geology, Math/Computer Science, Art/Art History, Biology, Philosophy, and Exercise Science.

Charge: Communicate with departments regarding the new interpretation to the Faculty Code on Visiting lines and their participation in faculty evaluations.

Rationale: The interpretation was affirmed by the Academic and Student Affairs Committee of the Board. This charge follows up on work in order to bring departmental procedures into compliance with the code.

Report: The PSC was not able to take up this charge during AY2014-15 and recommends that the charge be reissued next year.

Charge: Work collaboratively with the Bias-Education Response Team and the Student Life Committee to: 1) investigate existing University policies pertaining to the display of materials for campus /public consumption, 2) make recommendations for changes or additions to the existing University policies including the possibility of another statement regarding freedom of expression, and 3) consider revision or clarification of the procedures for “immediate response” to reported incidences of Bias-Hate (“Response Protocol of Bias-hate Incidents,” Section V.B.1.).

Rationale: This charge, issued by the Senate in February 2015, arose in response to a discussion of the Full Faculty.

Report: In agreeing to accept the above charge, the committee determined that the purview of the PSC is to compare the language of the Code to the language of the Response Protocol and to inform the Bias-Education Response Team (by way of the Committee on Diversity), the Student Life Committee, and the Senate to what degree the statement is consistent with the Code. Upon such review, the PSC distributed a list of recommended amendments to the Protocol. (SEE APPENDIX B.)

FACULTY REVIEW

***Charge:** Provide guidance on a situation in which a faculty member who is under review and has chosen an open file teaches in the same department as a spouse or partner. Is the evaluatee permitted to describe to her/his spouse or partner the contents of the open file, including letters from colleagues?

Rationale: This issue was brought to the PSC by the chair of a department. The concern is that the spouse/partner’s knowledge of the contents of colleague letters could potentially impact working relationships within the department.

Report: An “open” file means that colleague letters are available for viewing by the candidate, but they are not available for viewing by other departmental colleagues. Letters sent directly to the Academic Vice President are summarized by the Faculty Advancement committee in accord with the Faculty Code. The names of authors are identified and the candidate receives a summary of the content of those letters from the FAC. After viewing the letters in her/his file a candidate is free to talk with anyone, including a spouse or partner, about the content of the letters. Nonetheless,

if a department member feels as though professional ethics have been breached in or beyond a review, the Code indicates that she or he may file a grievance.

Charge: Continue conversation about evaluation schedule recommendations and the possibility of an ad hoc committee of former PSC/FAC members.

Rationale: This was a recommendation of the AY 2013-14 PSC year-end report.

Report: Building upon the work completed by the PSC in AY 2013-14, this year's PSC presented the recommendations for changes to the cycle of faculty evaluation (endorsed by the FAC) to the Faculty Senate. In turn, the Faculty Senate presented the recommendations to the Full Faculty, who voted in favor of the changes and, at a later meeting, voted to institute the changes in AY 2015-16, pending the approval of the Board of Trustees. Please SEE APPENDIX C for an explanation of the changes.

Charge: Create a cycle of review for department and program faculty evaluation standards and criteria.

Rationale: There exists no standing process by which departments and programs regularly review their standards of evaluation.

Report: The PSC was not able to take up this charge during AY2014-15 and recommends that the charge be reissued next year.

Charge: Review and consider endorsement of evaluation guidelines for faculty digital scholarship.

Rationale: As digital scholarship becomes a more common component of faculty professional growth, it is desirable for Puget Sound to implement guidelines for evaluation of such work.

Report: Dean Bartanen, who had authored the charge, presented background on the issue and its relevance to the PSC, as well as draft language for guidelines. The PSC discussed the topic on three occasions, their concerns centered on how to assess the value of digital scholarship across disciplines and whether or not the PSC should be involved in such an undertaking. Ultimately, Bartanen withdrew the charge, observing that perhaps the time is not yet right to act on this issue.

Charge: Clarify questions that have arisen about the faculty evaluation process as a result of the initial implementation of Moodle evaluation sites.

Rationale: The implementation of Moodle evaluation sites has raised questions that are as much about the overall process as they are about e-files, which offers opportunity to clarify process questions for evaluatees, head officers, and evaluators, including:

- (a) Should all administrative assistants be asked to scan Instructor and Course Evaluation Forms, rather than making photocopies? Should there be any revision to PSC-approved protocol for administration of and management of forms?

Report: The committee revised the PSC Evaluation Memo (2013-14) to

administrative assistants to incorporate scanning rather than photocopying of student evaluations. (SEE APPENDIX D) To address concerns about document security, the Buff Document will ask faculty members to delete electronic evaluation files from their computers.

(b) How are outside letters to be handled? Does the head officer, evaluatee, or administrative assistant add them to the e-file?

Report: In the Buff Document the PSC will make clear the conversations we've had about how and when to solicit and receive letters, as documented in the report on suggested revisions to the Interpretations of the Faculty Code. In short: outside letters should be included in the electronic file, and if the head officer needs help scanning, the administrative assistant can provide that support once the Moodle access shifts from the evaluatee to the department.

(c) Should evaluatees upload Instructor and Course Evaluation Forms?

Report: Yes, evaluatees should include these documents in pdf form on their Moodle review sites.

(d) What still needs to be provided in hard copy?

Report: Some evaluatees continue to have a "hybrid" file, e.g., a book to include. In these cases the "hard" materials will be provided as they always have been.

(e) Do departments whose timelines differ from the norm (e.g., Psychology requires their files to be submitted to the department six weeks ahead of due date; Religion guidelines allow the evaluatee access to the file after it is submitted) need to come into alignment? Where is it written that files are due to the department four weeks (20 working days) prior to being due to the FAC?

Report: The PSC discussed this issue at some length, considering the tension between the time constraints faced by the Educational Technology Staff in setting up and managing Moodle evaluation files and the need for some flexibility in due dates based upon departmental evaluation guidelines and longtime practices. Ultimately, the PSC approved for inclusion in the Buff Document a three-column table indicating when files are due to the department (at which point evaluatee access to the file ends), when outside letters are due to the head officer, and when the file is due to the Academic Vice President's office (at which point the FAC can access the file). In addition, the committee agreed on the following changes to due dates indicated by the Buff Document: 1) the December 12 due date for receipt of 3rd-year associate files by the department will be changed to the first day of Spring semester (to match Spring file due dates), unless the Board of Trustees approves the change to the 3rd-year associate review and the evaluatee no longer needs to provide a file for review; 2) the statement (on pp. 13 and 17) that tenure and promotion files are due to departments on September 1 will

be removed, for this date is not always accurate. The text will instead refer readers to the table of due dates.

(f) Additional questions contained in the FAQ prepared by Lauren Nicandri. **Report:** Dean Bartanen prepared a document for the PSC that identifies the key questions that have arisen about evaluation process as members of the faculty transitioned from paper to electronic files. Most of these questions concern due dates and are addressed by the PSC-approved changes to the Buff Document described above. Bartanen indicates that other issues will be cleared up going forward, both by learning from prior mistakes and simplifying processes: giving Moodle access to members of evaluations committees but not to the whole home department; making it easier for evaluatees to link to their Moodle course sites on their Moodle evaluation sites; scanning and “filing” of Instructor and Course Evaluation Forms.

FACULTY AND COURSE EVALUATION

Charge: Return to the issue of electronically administered instructor and course evaluations with the charge to the PSC to develop a faculty survey to assess the potential benefits and concerns of Puget Sound faculty regarding this possibility. After gathering data, provide the Senate with a summary of the problems to solve prior to implementation of any electronic option.

Rationale: This was a charge suggested in the PSC year-end report. However, the Senate acknowledges it may be too early to conduct a survey of the faculty on this issue for two primary reasons: 1) AY 2014 is the first year of systematic use of Moodle for faculty evaluation files which may cause survey confusion and 2) Technology Services needs more time still, given the continued updating of Peoplesoft, before determining a means of secure course evaluations in electronic form. The PSC may wish to table this until AY 2015.

Report: Given the reasons stated in the rationale, which was amended by the Senate (in response to PSC concerns) during Fall 2014, the committee deferred action on the implementation of electronic student evaluations.

***Charge:** Develop a policy or set of guidelines for course/faculty evaluation of team-taught courses.

Rationale: Faculty approach team-teaching in different ways. For example, co-teachers can participate in the course throughout the semester, whether by teaching simultaneously or taking turns, or they can divide the semester into segments, each one led by a different instructor. In the latter case, it makes sense to administer separate course/faculty evaluations for each instructor. In the former case, though, either joint or individual evaluations could be in order. No policy or set of guidelines exists to address this issue.

Report: The PSC was not able to take up this charge during AY2014-15 and recommends that the charge be reissued next year.

OTHER BUSINESS

In addition to taking up formal charges, the PSC attended to other matters during AY2014-15:

1. We reviewed and approved the Faculty Evaluation Guidelines for the Department of French Studies. We reviewed the guidelines for the Department of Art and Art History on May 5, 2015, our last meeting of the year. We sent recommendations for revision to Art and Art History.
2. Madlung issued a question: Given the PSC's determination of the validity of electronic signatures—that is, typed names—on outside letters, why must committees submit hard copies of minutes for archiving? The PSC solicited John Finney's opinion, and it was reported, that for archiving purposes paper copies are still preferred to electronic ones. Even so, the PSC reasoned, the Associate Deans' office can print out minutes that they receive electronically. The Committee agreed to recommend that all standing committees adopt such electronic delivery, relieving faculty of the task of delivering paper copies. The Committee also agreed that the date of posting on the University website be included with each set of minutes. This recommendation was conveyed to the Senate for their dissemination.
3. Dean Bartanen introduced a draft policy for PSC review and possible endorsement: "Faculty Opportunity Hire Policy." This process would provide for a (rare) recruitment and hire process different from what is outlined in the Faculty Recruitment Guidelines. The PSC shares responsibility for some of those guidelines and so engaged in the review of the draft policy. Our conversation involved specifically what we mean by "opportunity hire" and how an opportunity is created; the transparency of an "opportunity hire"; how consistent the draft policy is with the existing Faculty Recruitment Guidelines and with federal law; and to what degree the "opportunity hire" process conforms to existing practices. The PSC recommended changes to the document to address these questions and concerns. A final draft of the policy with the edited language was endorsed by the PSC on May 5, 2015.
4. Members of the Faculty Leave Working Group—Stacey Weiss, Ariela Tubert, and Kena Fox-Dobbs—reported to the committee on the newly drafted Medical and Family Leave policies and Disability Policy (the latter of which has not yet undergone significant revision). Following discussion, the PSC endorsed unanimously the draft Medical and Family Leave Policy, including a revision that automatic delay of any evaluation, not only the tenure evaluation, would accompany a leave.
5. Because the Buff Document includes quotations from Interpretations of the Faculty Code, and because those Interpretations have been revised, the PSC authorized Dean Bartanen to make the following revisions to the Buff Document during the summer of 2015 and to distribute the changes to committee members for their review: the paragraph on top of p. 9 shall be shortened, using the new Code language from Page 48, line 30-31, mentioned above, permitting electronic letters with electronic signatures. A paragraph on p. 14 concerns "informing letter writers about open and closed files." It shall be revised to reflect the revised Code interpretation calling for such information to go to outside letter writers in advance. The "checklist for head officers" on p. 20 shall be revised. #1 shall include an

instruction that when soliciting outside letters, the head officer notifies outside letter writers of the status of the file as open or closed. #3 shall include the following sentence, from the revised Interpretation of Page 48, line 10: "In consultation with the evaluatee, the head officer may also solicit appropriate letters from outside the department or university." Additionally all occurrences of "department chair" in the document shall be changed to "head of department, school, or program."

The charges that the PSC asks to be issued in the 2015-16 AY are:

- Solicit and review the revisions to the Faculty Evaluation Guidelines for the Department of Art and Art History recommended by the PSC in May 2015 (unless completed via email before May 15, 2015).
- Review the Course Assistant Guidelines submitted by Occupational Therapy to the PSC in April 2015.
- Review the Faculty Evaluation Guidelines submitted by the Department of Biology to the PSC in April 2015.
- Complete the review of the Interpretations of the Faculty Code yet to be evaluated in the summer of 2015 by the Title IX working group.
- Continue to communicate with departments who use Course Assistants regarding the new Interpretation to Faculty Code, Chapter 1, Part C, Section 2.a. Guidelines for Course Assistants, and review revised guidelines as needed.
- Communicate with departments regarding the new interpretation to the Faculty Code on Visiting lines and their participation in faculty evaluations.
- Create a cycle of review for department and program faculty evaluation standards and criteria.
- Develop a policy or set of guidelines for course/faculty evaluation of team-taught courses.
- Review the requirements for preparing and submitting evaluation files, in light of the Code changes made this year as to who participates in evaluations. The way things stand Associates prepare evaluation files only when they are being considered for promotion. On the other hand, professors prepare full evaluation files in all evaluations. The code calls for "a statement of professional goals and objectives, teaching materials, documentation of scholarly and professional activity, and evidence of university service, student advising, and community service related to professional interests and expertise." The Buff elaborates this much more fully, including "a statement of your professional objectives, both short-term and long-term, including a self-analysis of your teaching, scholarship, and service." It also calls for copies of courses materials to such an extent that people want simply to link to their Moodle course sites. This makes sense for tenure and promotion, but every five years for the duration?
- 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. **Please note: While the PSC self-authored this charge, on May 7, 2015, the PSC chair received a letter on the same subject from faculty members Greg Elliott, Jim Evans, and Andy Rex (SEE APPENDIX E).**

Finally, the Faculty Senate asked that standing committees self-assess to determine whether or not the number of members required of a committee is appropriate. The By-Laws indicate that the PSC “shall consist of the Dean of the University (ex-officio) and no fewer than seven appointed members of the Faculty.”

The PSC did not reach a unanimous decision about either question. Most members of the committee were comfortable with the current size of the committee but could also imagine reconstituting at 6 members + 1 ex-officio dean. One member of the PSC strongly believes that the committee would function well at half its size. To the objection that a smaller committee would not be representative all departments, the committee member pointed out that the PSC is not currently representative. Another potential problem with shrinking the PSC is that, in the event of a grievance, the PSC functions essentially as a jury. Having too few members would place great pressure upon committee members and may not well serve the parties involved in the grievance. One solution is to assign the committee fewer members but, when a grievance arises, to call upon past PSC members to serve for the duration of the grievance process. The Code contains some precedent for amending the constitution of the PSC during grievance processes: In Chapter VI, Section 4.b., “Grievance Procedure,” when there is “a conflict of interest concerning a member of the committee...the committee, at its discretion, may appoint a substitute to participate in the case.” If the Senate determines that the PSC can function well with fewer members, the Senate might charge the PSC with revising this section of the Code, or the Interpretation of this section, to include the plan articulated above.

In the main, the committee did not find its work to be superfluous, but it was noted that we wasted some time in considering how to revise certain Interpretations that would better have been sent first to the Dean of Diversity and Inclusion and the Department of Human Resources for a compliance check. One committee member believes that many documents the PSC reviews (e.g., Department Evaluation Requirements) are much lengthier than they need to be. Encouraging concision university-wide would lessen the work of all committees.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of the PSC,

Tiffany Aldrich MacBain, Chair

APPENDIX A

Recommended Revisions to Interpretations of the Faculty Code Professional Standards Committee 2014-15

Members: Kris Bartanen, Geoffrey Block, Douglas Cannon, Betsy Kirkpatrick, Tiffany MacBain (Chair), Andreas Madlung, Mark Reinitz, Amy Spivey

In the 2014-15 academic year, the Faculty Senate charged the Professional Standards Committee to “review all of the PSC interpretations of the Faculty Code to see if any have become obsolete by more recent interpretations and to ensure consistency of all interpretations with the current practice and policies on campus.” The PSC has completed the review and revised the interpretations as indicated below.

The PSC determines these revisions to be significant and so submits them in accordance with the instructions in the Faculty Code, Chapter I, Part G, Section 1: “If the Professional Standards Committee deems an interpretation to be of significant merit it shall issue a formal written interpretation which shall be delivered to the Faculty Senate for inclusion within the Senate minutes. Such interpretations shall also be forwarded to the Academic and Student Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees for its concurrence.”

Not included below, but in need of revision to align with existing policies, is the Interpretation of Chapter VI (Grievances arising from allegations of sexual harassment). Dean of Diversity and Inclusion Michael Benitez will recommend changes to this Interpretation following the university’s Title IX review in the summer of 2015.

APPENDIX

Page 39, line 8: Because the Appendix contains current interpretations and interpretations that are no longer active, change “This Appendix contains current interpretations” to read “This appendix contains such interpretations.”

Page 39, lines 23-48: Given that technology has evolved to the point where it is easy to search PDFs, and given the potentially incomplete nature over time of the list of references to “working days” in these lines of the Code, the PSC recommends that lines 23-48 be deleted from the Appendix.

Page 40, lines 8-14: Because these lines are outdated and do not align with the language of the “Campus Policy Prohibiting Harassment & Sexual Misconduct” document, delete lines 8-14. Add to the end of this Interpretation (of Chapter I, Part C, Section 2, and Chapter I, Part D, Section 4) the line: “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 & Sexual Misconduct.”

Page 41, throughout entire Interpretation of Chapter I, Part C, Section 2, and Chapter I, Part D, Section 4: To bring the language of the Code into compliance with Title IX, as recommended by Dean for Diversity and Inclusion Michael Benitez, replace “spouse” with “partner,” and replace “children” and “child” with “dependent children.”

Page 41, lines 42-49: Committee members expressed concern about ambiguity in the text regarding the timing of PSC reviews of departmental guidelines for the use of course assistants. Change the sentences beginning with “Thus” in line 42 to read, “Thus each department employing course assistants should submit to the Professional Standards Committee a document that explains the duties, responsibilities, and supervision of course assistants. The PSC will review departmental statements for agreement with the guidelines. Upon obtaining committee approval, the department may then employ course assistants in accordance with the departmental document and need not submit that document again for PSC review until the guidelines in the Code or the departmental document are revised.”

Page 42, line 9: To bring the language of the Code into compliance with Title IX, as recommended by Dean for Diversity and Inclusion Michael Benitez, use the gender-neutral pronoun “their” instead of “his/her” in the phrase, “in their courses.”

Page 43, line 15: To correct a problem with sentence structure, the PSC recommends changing the first sentence of line 15 to read, “The evaluation process is clearly career-influencing.”

Page 43, lines 38-39: To correct a typographical error sending readers to an incorrect section of the Code, and to align with the recommended language for page 45, line 5 (below), the PSC recommends changing the lines to read: “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.” The font size and type should be the same as the surrounding document.

Page 45, line 5: “department head” becomes “head of department, school, or program.” Change sentence to read: “The faculty member must request that there be a delay in consideration for tenure or promotion by writing to the head of department, school, or program and the Academic Vice President, normally no later than one semester before the scheduled evaluation.”

Page 46, Interpretation of Chapter III, section 4. To bring the language of the Code into compliance with Title IX, as recommended by Dean for Diversity and Inclusion Michael Benitez, replace “spouse” and “mate” with “partner.”

Page 47, lines 31-34: To correct outdated language (“photocopied”) and to affirm the writers’ ownership of their letters of evaluation, the PSC recommends that the lines read: “In the case of an open file, the faculty member being evaluated has access to letters in the evaluation file and may take notes while reviewing the file. If the faculty member desires copies of the letters, the faculty member must seek copies from the writers.”

Page 48, line 10: To clarify how outside letters should be solicited for faculty evaluations, add the following statement after the phrase “if they seem relevant”: “In consultation with the evaluatee, the head officer may also solicit appropriate letters from outside the department or university. When soliciting the letters the head officer will notify the letter writers of the status of the file as open or closed.”

Page 48, line 17: For consistency’s sake, change “confidential letters” to “a closed file.”

Page 48, line 18: For clarity’s sake, change “those individuals who submitted letters and a summary...” to “those individuals who submitted letters to the head officer and a summary....”

Page 48, line 19: To correct an error of reference, change “Faculty Code: Chapter III, Section 4, b (2) (a) and Section 4, b (2) (b)” to “Faculty Code: Chapter III, Section 4, b (2) (a) and Section 4, b (2) (e).”

Page 48, lines 29-30: Because the university affirms the validity of electronic signatures, change bracketed note to read: “As defined for purposes of interpretation, a letter of evaluation is a signed document.”

APPENDIX B

To:

George S Tomlin;
Brad Reich;

Cc:

Derek T Buescher;

Dear George and Brad,

As requested by the Faculty Senate, the PSC has reviewed the university's freedom of expression statement for its consistency with the Faculty Code. I'm writing to share our findings with the Student Life Committee and the Committee on Diversity so that you may proceed with your review and/or revision according to your committee schedules. (I am also ccing Derek Buescher, the Senate liaison for the PSC.) Below is a paragraph summarizing the PSC's response:

The committee discussed the new Senate charge to review our statement regarding freedom of expression. The committee compared the language of the paragraph in the [Response Protocol for Incidents of Bias or Hate](#) with the language in the Faculty Code, pp. 2, 3, 5 and 6. The committee identified three areas for discussion. First, the Code states more clearly than the Protocol the distinction between academic freedom and the constitutional right to freedom of expression; it asserts that faculty have the freedom to pursue academic areas authorized by their expertise. The Protocol does not currently acknowledge that the Code recognizes academic freedom as beyond freedom of expression, and that the Code states that it is "an additional assurance to those who teach and pursue knowledge" (page 5) . The committee recommends that the Protocol be amended to include language acknowledging academic freedom of the faculty as defined in the Code or to reference the relevant sections of the Code (Ch. 1, p. 3, lines 10-12.). Second, the committee observed that the second half of the paragraph in the Protocol is more restrictive than the Code. The language in the Protocol seems overstated, urging caution against causing student discomfort, whereas the committee recognizes that discomfort often precedes learning. Furthermore, we prefer the word "injured" as in the Code (Ch 1. p.3, line 10) rather than the word "wounding." Similarly, the word "safe" implies more than physical safety; we suggest a clarification of the distinction between physical or emotional safety and freedom from discomfort. Third, the Protocol paragraph is intended to cover faculty, staff and students, whereas the Code covers only faculty. In this regard, the language should also be compared for consistency with relevant documents covering staff and students.

I hope you find our response to be of some use.

All the best,
Tiffany

APPENDIX C

Current Faculty Code Language	Amended Faculty Code Language, approved by the Faculty on 3/10/2015; proposed to ASAC for approval 5/15/2015.
<p>Chapter III, Section 2 - When Faculty are Evaluated</p> <p>Faculty shall be evaluated at specified points in their careers with the university, in the manner provided in this chapter.</p> <p>a. Evaluation shall occur prior to all decisions to: (1) promote a faculty member; (2) grant or deny tenure to a faculty member without tenure; and (3) not reappoint a tenure-line faculty member without tenure.</p> <p>b. An evaluation by the head officer shall be made at the conclusion of each year for the first two years of the appointment of a faculty member without tenure, or earlier if a question of non-reappointment is at stake. A copy of the head officer's report shall be sent to the individual under evaluation and to the dean. A copy of the head officer's report shall be placed in the faculty member's evaluation file (Chapter III, Section 8). Except in cases of non-reappointment (Chapter II, Section 5), no further action is required.</p> <p>Persons in the rank of instructor, assistant professor, and associate professor normally shall be evaluated every three years, and professors normally shall be evaluated every five years unless an earlier evaluation is requested by the faculty member, the head officer, or the dean. Unless a more frequent evaluation schedule is specified in the initial appointment letter, evaluations after the third year of employment normally will not be undertaken at intervals shorter than three years. At least one year shall pass between the completion of a normally scheduled evaluation and any new evaluation undertaken solely at the request of the evaluatee.</p>	<p>b. An evaluation by the head officer shall be made at the conclusion of each year for the first two years of the appointment of a faculty member without tenure, or earlier if a question of non-reappointment is at stake. An evaluation by the head officer shall also be made after each three year period of service for those at the rank of associate professor who are not candidates for tenure or promotion unless the evaluatee elects to proceed with a full review in accord with the procedures detailed in Chapter III, section 4. A copy of the head officer's report shall be sent to the individual under evaluation and to the dean. A copy of the head officer's report shall be placed in the faculty member's evaluation file (Chapter III, Section 8). Except in cases of non-reappointment (Chapter II, Section 5), no further action is required.</p>

APPENDIX D

DATE: October 8, 2014
TO: «Chair_First» «Chair_Last», «DepartmentProgramSchool»
FROM: Kris Bartanen, Academic Vice President
SUBJECT: 2014-2015 Course Evaluations

Each year the dean's office and the chairs identify those faculty members for whom departments should administer Instructor and Course Evaluation Forms during the coming year. The list attached includes all faculty currently identified by the dean's office as scheduled for 2015-2016 evaluation by the Faculty Advancement Committee (1) for tenure or promotion consideration; (2) for a three-year evaluations as an instructor, assistant professor or associate professor; or (3) for a five-year evaluation as a professor. It includes as well faculty who are scheduled for tenure evaluation in 2016-2017. Finally, the list includes visiting faculty who should be evaluated on an annual basis, generally in order to provide information on visiting faculty performance to the associate dean's office rather than for Advancement Committee review. For those visiting faculty members whose appointments are renewable and continue beyond the second year, please consult with me regarding a review prior to renewal beyond the third year (see page 23 in the *Faculty Evaluation Criteria and Procedures, 2014-2015* document).

Please note that faculty eligible for tenure consideration in 2017-2018 who anticipate a junior sabbatical fellowship or any other form of one-semester leave should request that Instructor and Course Evaluation Forms be administered in spring 2015 to provide the four semesters of evaluation required for the tenure file. If a full-year leave is anticipated, evaluation forms should also be administered in fall 2014.

Departmental staff should plan to administer Instructor and Course Evaluations for identified faculty before the end of fall term and again toward the end of spring term.

The Professional Standards Committee has established the following procedures for administering university Instructor and Course Evaluation Forms:

1. Instructor and Course Evaluations are to be scheduled by faculty members and administered and processed by professional staff and not by work-study students or faculty.
2. Instructor and Course Evaluation Forms should normally be completed no earlier than the tenth week of class; an exception may be in a team-taught course in which a faculty member only teaches a small segment of the course, in which case evaluation forms can be administered at the conclusion of the faculty member's participation in the course.
3. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to ensure that students are allocated at least twenty minutes of class time to complete Instructor and Course Evaluation Forms. Twenty minutes are required for each faculty member when team teachers are evaluated during the same class period.
4. Faculty members should normally avoid scheduling required evaluations on the last day of class.
5. At whatever point in the class period Instructor and Course Evaluation Forms are administered, the faculty member should absent himself or herself from the classroom before the staff member brings the evaluation forms in and may return only after the staff member has taken the Instructor and Course Evaluation Forms out of the classroom.
6. Students who do not attend the class session at which Instructor and Course Evaluation Forms are administered may not complete an evaluation at any other time.

Please note that the Academic Vice President's copy (white) of the completed Instructor and Course Evaluation Forms must remain under the control of professional staff at all times and should not be

given to the faculty member, the chair, or any other party while the forms remain the responsibility of the department. Professional staff, not work-study students, should process as soon as feasible those forms on which students have requested that their comments be typed and, once typed, shred the handwritten copies of those forms.

In the past, professional staff members have securely photocopied the completed forms onto yellow paper (for the faculty member) and pink paper (for the department). This year, we will adopt a more cost-effective, environmentally responsible, and efficient practice: professional staff will scan evaluations and save each course group as a .pdf (labeled clearly, e.g., Name ENGL 220 Fall 2014). Staff should then forward the complete set of white copies and the relevant .pdfs for all required evaluations to the Office of the Academic Vice President. (White copies for visiting professors, adjunct faculty, and emeriti faculty evaluations should go to the associate dean's office unless designated for formal review.)

Professional staff should handle the departmental copy of the evaluation forms and the faculty member copy with similar care. Staff should forward the .pdfs of evaluation forms directly to the chair and to the faculty member when processing is complete and after course grades have been submitted. Normally, the chair may review copies of student evaluations once course grades have been submitted for the term. There may be circumstances, however, when a chair needs to review evaluation forms before grades have been submitted (e.g., preparing a recommendation for a visiting faculty member seeking employment elsewhere); in such limited instances, and provided written notice (e-mail is acceptable) is given to the evaluatee and/or the dean, the chair may review confidentially .pdf copies before grades have been submitted. The chair and departmental staff should insure that the .pdf copies remain available for use in the evaluation process.

Faculty other than those listed on the attached page may choose to have one or more courses evaluated. Please note that the white copies resulting from such voluntary evaluations should **not** be forwarded to the Office of the Academic Vice President at the time the evaluations are completed. Because some faculty members may decide to include voluntary evaluations in a future evaluation file, however, the white copies of these completed forms, and .pdf department copies, should be made by professional staff and should remain under staff control in the department until the faculty member has determined whether or not they will be used in a future evaluation file. Once course grades have been submitted for the term, the professional staff member will forward .pdf copies of evaluations forms to the faculty member. **All evaluations conducted using the university Instructor and Course Evaluation Form must be conducted under these procedures, unless an exception is approved in advance by the PSC.** Forms are available in the Office of the Academic Vice President.

Please sign and return one copy of this memo to the Office of the Academic Vice President by **October 13, 2014** to verify that your records and ours agree. If they do not agree, please notify my office immediately, either by telephone (extension 3205), or at my e-mail address: acadvp@pugetsound.edu.

Thank you.

Signature, «Chair_First» «Chair_Last»

Date

cc: «Admin_First» «Admin_Last», «DepartmentProgramSchool»

APPENDIX E

To: Ariela Tubert, Chair of the Faculty Senate, and
Tiffany MacBain, Chair of the Professional Standards Committee
From: Jim Evans, Andy Rex and Greg Elliott
Subject: Conflicting interpretations of a key passage in the Faculty Code
Date: May 6, 2015

It has come to our attention that the Faculty Advancement Committee has, over the course of the years, implemented varying interpretations of a key passage in the Faculty Code governing the evaluation of faculty for promotion to the rank of full professor. The possible consequences for evaluations are considerable. The key passage of the Code (Chapter III, Section 3e) reads:

“[1] Faculty promotion shall be based upon the quality of a person's performance of academic duties. [2] 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. [3] Because the university seeks the highest standards for faculty advancement, mere satisfactory performance is no guarantee of promotion. [4] In addition, appointment in the rank of associate professor and professor normally requires a doctoral, or other equivalent terminal degree. [5] Advancement to the rank of full professor is contingent upon evidence of distinguished service in addition to sustained growth in the above-mentioned areas.”

We have numbered the sentences and put them into square brackets for reference below. The problematic statement is [5]: “Advancement to the rank of full professor is contingent upon evidence of distinguished service in addition to sustained growth in the above-mentioned areas.”

One interpretation is that “evidence of distinguished service” refers to distinguished university service (or perhaps some combination of university and community service). A different interpretation has been that “distinguished service” means something like “distinguished performance of one’s duties.” This is the interpretation that all three of us were told about by the people who hired us, when we first arrived at UPS (and on many occasions afterwards). And, in the interpretation we were introduced to, it refers to all areas of one’s work—teaching, professional growth, advising, university service and community service.

It is easy to see how this piece of text could be read in different ways. While the FAC must address each case for promotion individually, and make the call in gray areas, they should not have to operate under a passage of the Code so susceptible to conflicting interpretations. It is vital that the faculty also have a clear understanding of the criteria as they work towards promotion to full professor. We feel that this issue is of sufficient importance for future evaluations (as well as for the current crop of associate professors

who are preparing for evaluations in the near future) that the meaning of the text should be clarified soon. We urge that the issue be taken up, either by the Senate, or by the Professional Standards Committee. We can imagine two possible outcomes, either of which would be worthwhile: either the PSC could issue a ruling clarifying this passage of the Code, or the Senate could involve the faculty in a larger way to clarify the meaning that this passage will have for the future. It is a substantive issue and will play a role in determining what sort of institution we wish to be. When someone is promoted to full professor, shall this be because the person did distinguished work with teaching and scholarship counting most, or because the person did distinguished university service?

In closing, we offer a close reading of the passage in question, which, we believe, demonstrates that the interpretation based on “distinguished overall performance” is the logical choice.

In [2] we are told of the five areas that matter, and their rank in importance. So it would be odd if in [5] the areas that are fourth and fifth in importance are suddenly promoted to be very important indeed, without any explanation.

In [5], “distinguished service” is not qualified by “university” or “community,” so there is no direct textual evidence to support the university service interpretation. The most one would have to go on is an inference, since university service and community service are the only items in the list of five categories that involve the word “service.” It also would be an odd, somewhat redundant construction to single out only one category (service) for the distinguished criterion, followed by the list of all five categories for the sustained growth criterion, when these five also include university and community service, which have just been said to require distinction. A more plausible alternative is that “service” is being used in a general way, as when we say “for 30 years of loyal and meritorious service,” when giving someone a gold watch at retirement. The document was written some 40 years ago, or more, using the language of its day and somewhat heightened language at that.

If in [5] “distinguished service” means distinguished overall performance, that interpretation does not represent a sharp break in the logic of the paragraph (as it would if we took “distinguished service” to be suddenly promoting university service to prime importance). Rather it continues the logic of [3]. For in [3] we learn that mere satisfactory performance is no guarantee of promotion. [5] then makes this specific by saying that “Advancement to the rank of full professor is contingent upon evidence of distinguished service...” Not mere satisfactory performance, then, but distinguished service is required. [5] concludes by clarifying that, no matter what manner of distinction the faculty member demonstrates, it is still necessary to show sustained growth in all five areas.