

## **Faculty Meeting Minutes February 9, 1998**

President Pierce called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m. Twenty-eight voting members of the faculty were present.

Minutes of the December 9, 1997 faculty meeting were approved as published.

In response to President Pierce's call for announcements, Bob Matthews wished everyone a happy Saint David's day. [Later he explained to the secretary that "St. David is the patron saint of Wales (as important to the Welsh as St. Patrick is to the Irish), and his day, March 1, is celebrated all over Wales and by the Welsh in America."]

President Pierce drew our attention to drawings and a scale model of the new academic building to be built near Warner Gym. She reported that changes to the University's master plan in connection with the new building were approved by the City of Tacoma in December, 1997. She said construction would begin a year from now.

President Pierce announced that Franklin Raines will be our commencement speaker next May. Mr. Raines is director of the federal Office of Budget and Management and a former trustee of the University.

President Pierce reported on last week's meeting of the Board of Trustees. She said that a budget for next year was approved, based on a 4.2% aggregate increase in tuition and room and board fees. She said that a subcommittee is recommending to trustees that Union Avenue housing be renovated. Guidelines governing the Union Avenue houses will be developed this spring for final approval by trustees in May.

President Pierce reported that we have passed the \$28 million mark in the capital campaign. This amount includes \$12 million added to the endowment for financial aid, and was a factor in keeping the tuition increase for next year as low as it is.

President Pierce briefly described a new Alumni Relations/Admission collaboration to involve alumni in recruiting. She also reported progress in involving alumni in the career services we offer students.

President Pierce reported that the National Alumni Board recently voted to reaffirm the university's historic colors of maroon and white. She said the Student Senate voted to urge the university to adopt a single set of colors as soon as possible. She described this as a "grass roots" effort and expects campus-wide discussion this spring to yield a recommendation to trustees in May.

Terry Cooney reported that the trustees approved a revised mission statement that will appear soon on the university's accreditation web page.

At 4:19 p.m. President Pierce asked Dean Cooney to preside over discussion of proposed changes to the *Faculty Code*. Dean Cooney said that he would offer President Pierce the opportunity to resume the chair as we began discussing each new section in the code. Dean Cooney asked Code Revision Committee (CRC) members David Droge and John Riegsecker to continue leading us through the proposed changes one by one. After the most recent faculty meeting on December 9, 1997, one additional document was distributed to faculty by the CRC, dated January 27, 1998. This one-page green sheet contained six changes to chapter III revisions originally proposed in the buff-colored document dated December 1, 1997.

**We first considered proposed change #32, to Chapter III, creating a new Section 3:**

University of Puget Sound Faculty Meeting Minutes  
February 9, 1998, Page 2

*Section 3.a.: The Professional Standards Committee, in consultation with the Faculty Advancement Committee and the dean, shall agree upon and publish periodically a statement of university evaluation standards.*

*Section 3.b.: Departments shall state in writing the criteria, standards and needs of the department used in the departmental evaluation process in relation to the University's standards and needs. The Professional Standards Committee shall approve departmental criteria and standards.*

Written commentary from the January 27, 1998 green memo to faculty that explained the reasons for the proposed change follow:

*The rationale for creation of a new Section 3 is that the CRC wished to separate out Code discussion of criteria and standards for evaluation from Code discussion of procedures for evaluation. The new Section 3 addresses criteria and standards; the new Section 4 addresses evaluation procedure.*

*Currently, university criteria for evaluation are stated in the Faculty Code. The PSC publishes an interpretation of those criteria both as an expression of university standards and as a guideline within which departments develop specific criteria and standards as appropriate to departmental needs. Departmental criteria and standards are reviewed for approval by the PSC. We believe that proposed revisions of Section 3.a. and 3.b. explain that process clearly.*

*Currently, the PSC publishes guidelines for evaluation procedures and colleague evaluation letters (the latter being what we believe is meant by the reference to guidelines for "substantive comments" in existing Code Section 3.b.). The PSC, as directed in this same section, approves departmental "procedures". We believe the Code would be clearer if:*

*(1) it stated that the entire evaluation process, not just the departmental evaluation process, should ensure that adequate consideration is given the evaluatee (hence proposed change #38);*

*(2) it outlined in chronological order the procedures for evaluation starting at the departmental level and proceeding through review by the FAC and, if applicable, the President and the Board of Trustees. We have, thus, reorganized Chapter III to articulate in new Section 4 a clear statement of the existing evaluation process, beginning at the departmental level.*

Kris Bartanen reminded us that Section 3 addresses standards for evaluation, while Section 4 addresses procedures. Doug Cannon asked about the role of specific department procedures. Bartanen responded that that was a problem the revisions were intended to address; that departments would work within code language unless the Professional Standards Committee (PSC) approved a department's proposal for variations in procedures, as allowed under proposed change #39.

**We next considered proposed change #33, to Chapter III, Section 3,c:**

*Add: "In all reviews, the provisions of Faculty Code, Chapter I, Parts B and C shall serve as fundamental definitions of faculty responsibility."*

There was no discussion.

**We next considered proposed change #34, to Chapter III, Section 3,d:**

*Move from Chapter IV, Section 4 - Criteria for Tenure, existing language.*

University of Puget Sound Faculty Meeting Minutes  
February 9, 1998, Page 3

*Move from Chapter III, Section 4, b. existing language on responsibility for meeting the standards for tenure or promotion resting with the evaluatee.*

Ted Taranovski asked why the first sentence of the old Chapter IV, Section 4 was being deleted. Bartanen responded that the sentence remains in Chapter IV, Section 1,d.

**We next considered proposed change #35, to Chapter III, Section 3,e:**

*Substitute: "Promotion to associate or full professor shall be based upon the quality of a faculty member's performance. Specifically, a decision to promote shall be based upon the following considerations, listed in order of importance: (1) proven excellence in teaching; (2) distinct evidence of professional growth; (3) contributions to university service; (4) a sound record of student advising; and (5) community service related to professional interests and expertise. Because the university seeks the highest standards for faculty advancement, mere satisfactory performance is not an adequate basis for promotion. Appointment in the rank of associate professor and professor normally requires a doctorate or other equivalent terminal degree. Advancement to the rank of full professor is contingent upon evidence of distinguished performance and sustained growth in the above-mentioned areas."*

*For: "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 in 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."*

Tom Fikes asked why there is a wording difference between "a record of service to the university" and "contributions to university service" in the new Sections 3d and 3e, respectively. Dean Cooney suggested that the word "record" had been used in another phrase during re-wording. The CRC's larger effort had been to seek greater parallelism between the statement of criteria for tenure and for promotion in response to several suggestions from faculty that such an effort was needed. Taranovski pointed out that there are two kinds of promotion that are linked in Section 3e: to associate and to full professor. Do the criteria differ, he asked, and could this be a problem in the future?

Matthews said he thought that some of what we were discussing seemed to be substantive change, rather than clarification. David Droge responded that the more helpful distinction is between policy change and clarification, and that the charge to the CRC was to avoid making policy changes. He said that the "substantive change vs. clarification" distinction "muddies the water."

We then turned to consideration of changes to Section 4 of Chapter III. President Pierce asked Dean Cooney to continue presiding. **We considered proposed change #36, to Chapter III, Section 4:**

*Substitute: "a" for "his"  
"the evaluation file" for "all material"  
"Academic and Student Affairs" for "Instruction"*

University of Puget Sound Faculty Meeting Minutes  
February 9, 1998, Page 4

*"When Board action is required, the president forwards a recommendation and the evaluation file to the Academic and Student Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees."*

There was no discussion.

**We next considered proposed change #37, to Chapter III, Section 4:**

*Move to this section, language from existing code section 4, c.*

*Delete: "(materials and documentation which can be reviewed)"*

*Substitute: "the" for "a"*

*"review" for "decision"*

*Thus creating:*

*"The evaluation process is designed to provide a substantial body of credible evidence in writing as the basis for a fair and impartial review."*

*Instead of:*

*"The evaluation process is designed to provide a substantial body of credible evidence in writing (materials and documentation which can be reviewed) as a basis for a fair and impartial decision."*

There was no discussion.

**We considered proposed change #38, to Chapter III, Section 4:**

*Delete: "departmental" at \* in sentence below.*

*Substitute: "be achieved consistent with" for "consist of"*

*Substitute: "Sections 2-4" for "Section 4, a, c, d, e, f, g, and h."*

*"The \* evaluation process should ensure that adequate consideration is given the faculty member involved. Adequate consideration shall be achieved consistent with the criteria and procedures outline in Chapter III, Sections 2-4."*

There was no discussion.

**We considered proposed change #39, to Chapter III, Section 4,a:**

*Add: "Evaluation within the department, school or program is a significant professional responsibility. When a faculty member is subject to review, the departmental evaluation proceeds as follows:"*

There was no discussion.

At this point in the December 1, 1997 buff document appeared the following explanatory statements that are repeated here for the record:

*NOTE: Current Code III.4.a. is moved to III.3.b. See Change # 32.*

*Current Code III.4.b. is moved in part to III.3.d. See change # 34.*

*Current Code III.4.b. is moved in part to IV.a (1) (a). See change #41.*

*Current Code III.4.b. is moved in part to IV.b (3). See change #51.*

*Current Code III.4.c. is moved in part to III.4.a (1) (b). See Change #42.*

*Current Code III.4.c. is moved in part to III.4. a (2). See Change #45.*

*Current Code III.4.c. is moved in part to III.4. See Change #37.*

**We next considered proposed change #40, to Chapter III, Section 4,a(1):**

Insert (into language in existing Code, Chapter III, section 4, d): "The head officer shall gather information in writing about the faculty member being evaluated from the faculty member; from colleagues in the department, school, or program; and from other sources if they seem relevant. Examples of information from other sources include statements about the evaluatee's teaching from colleagues with whom the evaluatee team-teaches in interdisciplinary programs, statements from university colleagues about the evaluatee's university service contribution, or statements from outside the university about an evaluatee's professional growth or community service. Within the department, written information is gathered through the following process:

There was no discussion.

**We considered proposed change #41, to Chapter III, Section 4,a(1)(a):**

Substitute: "The evaluatee prepares a file for departmental review. The evaluatee is responsible for providing for review 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 evaluatee shall also provide student course evaluations from the most recent two semesters of teaching; in the case of a tenure evaluation, student course evaluations shall be from the most recent four semesters of teaching."

For (existing Code, Chapter III, Section 4, b): "The evaluatee is responsible for providing a statement of professional goals and objectives, pertinent documents, and materials prior to the departmental evaluation."

Grace Kirchner pointed out that student evaluations are normally collected by departments, not by the evaluatee as the proposed change implies. Dean Cooney agreed that Kirchner was correct, and suggested that the CRC fix this.

**We considered proposed change #42, to Chapter III, Section 4,a(1)(b):**

Substitute: "Departmental colleagues assemble information from ongoing evaluation processes and review the evaluatee's file. Faculty should be familiar with (1) the evaluatee's professional objectives and philosophy, both as outlined in the evaluatee's statement and as demonstrated in practice; (2) the evaluatee's teaching performance/effectiveness, including the organization and construction of courses and the exhibition of pedagogical skill, as assessed through examination of course materials, an ongoing process of class visitation, and the careful review of student evaluations; (3) the evaluatee's record of professional growth, as assessed through examination of evidence in the evaluation file and ongoing attendance to the evaluatee's scholarly and creative activity; (4) the evaluatee's contributions through university service, as documented in the evaluatee's file; (5) the evaluatee's service as an advisor; and (6) the evaluatee's involvement in community service related to professional interests and expertise."

For (existing Code, Chapter III, Section 4, c): "The departmental evaluation process should be an ongoing one. Faculty should become familiar with (1) the evaluatee's professional objectives and philosophy; (2) teaching, including course organization and construction and pedagogical skill; (3) students' perceptions of the evaluatee's teaching through an ongoing process of class visitation, discussion and review of student evaluations; (4) professional growth; and (5) university service and community service related to professional interests and expertise."

University of Puget Sound Faculty Meeting Minutes  
February 9, 1998, Page 6

Taranovski said he thought the language of the first sentence in the substitute paragraph was obtuse, referring to "ongoing evaluation processes." Bartanen responded that the code requires that the evaluation process be ongoing.

**We considered proposed change #43, to Chapter III, Section 4,a(1)(c):**

Substitute: "Departmental colleagues participating in the evaluation write letters. The letters colleagues shall be substantive assessments of the evaluatee's performance based on the factors in paragraph (b). When the evaluatee is eligible for a change in status, the letters shall forward the writers' independent recommendations. Normally, letters are forwarded to the head officer; individual faculty members may send their observations and recommendations directly to the dean."

For (existing Code, Chapter III, Section 4, d): "The head officer shall gather information in writing . . ." and (existing Code, Chapter III, Section 4, g): "Individual faculty members may send their observations and recommendations directly to the dean."

There was no discussion.

**We considered proposed change #44, to Chapter III, Section 4,a(1)(d):**

Substitute: "Except in tenure evaluations, when letters of evaluation must be confidential, the faculty member being evaluated shall have the right to examine letters of evaluation. The faculty member may choose to waive this access. The decision of the faculty member to waive or not waive confidentiality shall not be a factor in evaluating the faculty member."

For (existing Code, Chapter III, Section 9, e): "It [a faculty member's evaluation file] shall be open to the faculty member involved, except when the purpose of the evaluation is to grant or deny tenure," and "A faculty member shall have the right to waive access to letters of evaluation . . ." and "The decision of the faculty member to waive or not waive confidentiality shall not be a factor in evaluating the faculty member."

Please note that provisions on access to summary of confidential letters and the evaluation file maintained in the dean's office are treated below (items #83 and #84).

There was no discussion.

**We considered proposed change #45, to Chapter III, Section 4,a(2):**

Substitute: "When the information is assembled, members of the department, school or program other than the evaluatee shall meet to deliberate and make a recommendation. When the evaluatee is eligible for a change in status, the departmental recommendation shall be based on the recommendations of the tenure-line faculty. There should be evidence that the department had available the necessary materials and documentation and that adequate consideration has been given to the evaluatee's record. As it moves forward from the department, school or program, the evaluatee's file, when considered as a whole, must indicate that faculty involved in the departmental evaluation process had a sufficient degree of familiarity with the evaluatee's professional performance."

University of Puget Sound Faculty Meeting Minutes  
February 9, 1998, Page 7

*For (existing Code, Chapter III, Section 4, e): When the information has been assembled and evaluated by the department, a departmental recommendation shall be reached by members of the department other than the evaluatee through a deliberative procedure based upon the above information considered in light of departmental and university needs (tenure cases only) and standards. There should be evidence that the department had available the necessary materials and documentation and that adequate consideration has been given to the candidate's qualifications.*

*And for (existing Code, Chapter III, Section 4, c): "The candidate's file, when considered as a whole, must indicate that faculty involved in the evaluation process had a sufficient degree of familiarity with these aspects of the candidate's professional performance."*

Sue Owen asked if the substitute language means that only tenure track faculty can participate in the evaluation. John Riegsecker responded that non-tenure track faculty could participate, but that only tenure-track faculty could vote on the recommendation. Owen asked if departments could ask for an exception to this. In response to Bartanen's affirmative response, Owen asked why, then, would we establish the practice in the first place? Riegsecker said it was a "jury of your peers" situation. Taranovski said he was concerned that the PSC was empowered "to modify the code." Dean Cooney expressed some concern that if different departments use different procedures, that could lay the groundwork for legal challenges.

Kathie Hummel-Berry said that the physical therapy department must use instructors in the evaluation process as equals to tenure-line faculty. Bill Haltom suggested that in a legal challenge it wouldn't matter whether the source of arbitrariness was the department or the PSC; that either way, it is a matter of cutting non-tenure line faculty out of a vote, and there should be a compelling reason for doing that. He said we should leave the situation as it currently is, rather than disenfranchise non-tenure line faculty up front. Dean Cooney suggested that we need better language on this and that the CRC should take it up again.

Dean Cooney then asked for comments on the second part of proposed change #45, which requires that departments shall make their recommendations in meetings. Haltom and Taranovski said this was a good idea. Taranovski added that departments that don't "should be taken out and whipped."

We adjourned at 5:26 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John M. Finney  
Secretary of the Faculty.