

Faculty Meeting Minutes March 3, 1998

President Pierce called the meeting to order at 4:08 p.m. Twenty-five voting members of the faculty were present.

Minutes of the February 9, 1998 faculty meeting were approved as published.

There were no announcements

President Pierce and Dean Cooney had no report. President Pierce asked Dean Cooney to continue to preside over discussion of proposed changes to the *Faculty 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 February 9, 1998, one additional document was distributed to faculty by the CRC, dated February 25, 1998. This two-page green sheet contained five changes to chapter III revisions originally proposed in the buff-colored document dated December 1, 1997.

We continued from the February 9, 1998 meeting discussion of change #45 by considering a CRC revision to change #45, Chapter III, Section 4,a(2):

When the information is assembled, members of the department, school or program other than the evaluatee shall meet to deliberate and made a recommendation. When the evaluatee is eligible for a change in status, the departmental recommendation shall normally be based on the recommendations of the tenure-line faculty. In exceptional cases, the department may request approval from the Professional Standards Committee for inclusion of the recommendations of other ongoing faculty in the determination of the departmental recommendation on change of status. 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.

Written commentary from the February 25, 1998 green memo to faculty that explained the reasons for revisions since February 9 to proposed change #45 follows:

This revision allows for circumstances in which non-tenure line faculty recommendations may be included in a departmental recommendation on change of status. Note that the provisions of change #45 do not preclude non-tenure line faculty from writing evaluation letters, or otherwise participating in the departmental evaluation process. The provision only addresses determination of the departmental recommendation in a case of tenure and/or promotion.

Bill Haltom initiated discussion by asking what the reason was "for cutting out non-tenure-line faculty." David Droge responded that it was "a matter of peer review," because tenure-line and non-tenure-line faculty face different expectations. Ted Taranovski suggested that inclusion of the word "normally" invites exceptions. Haltom suggested that what we were doing here was changing the code without clarifying it. John Riegsecker said that, under the old language, visiting professors are not precluded from voting, suggesting that some change is needed. Harry Velez Quinones agreed that the word "normally" creates ambiguity and said it should be removed. Haltom asked why, if our intention was to cut out "transient" faculty, we were cutting out instructors also. Velez responded that, given the kind of institution we are now, tenure-line faculty and instructors face radically different expectations. He said that the two groups have qualitatively different kinds of jobs, with instructors teaching lower-division courses disseminating knowledge and career faculty being both teachers and scholars. He said that a tenure recommendation should be made by tenure-line peers only.

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

Larry Stern suggested that if the word "normally" remains, something must follow that explains it. Dean Cooney suggested that the next sentence may serve that function. He and President Pierce said that the code cannot say that each department can do whatever it wants to in evaluating faculty; there must be consistency across departments. Stern wondered how the Professional Standards Committee (PSC) would grant exceptions and whether there would be any guarantee of consistency in granting them. Droge responded that it was the job of the PSC to achieve consistency.

Doug Cannon worried that this issue would overwhelm the proceedings. He asked if it could be decided separately. Dean Cooney responded that anything we decide is subject to discussion later; that we are working toward a basic document that can be amended. Grace Kirchner confirmed that was the intention of the Faculty Senate in proposing the code review process and that the faculty had voted in favor of this process. Riegsecker said his understanding was that amendments would be circulated in writing ahead of time.

Taranovski asked why we couldn't delete the word "normally" and refer specifically to non-tenure line instructors. Stern responded that we can't work out all the exceptions here. He suggested leaving the current wording with the expectation that the PSC would work out exceptions. Bill Breitenbach suggested that the words "be based" obfuscate. He said the original "be reached" were more clear.

Kirchner asked if the proposed revision has implications for which colleagues can participate in the deliberative process. Dean Cooney responded "no." Kirchner suggested that we probably should be worried about that, since we have instructors involved in deliberations in some departments and not in others.

Dean Cooney suggested that perhaps the CRC could "scratch its head about this issue one more time."

We next considered proposed change #46, to Chapter III, Section 4,a(3):

46. Chapter III, Section 4, a (3): (pages 8-9)

Create new section: "Variations in the department, school or program evaluation process:"

Move existing language from Chapter III, Section 4, d (about assistants to the chair and about when the head officer is subject of evaluation).

Add: (c) When a faculty member being evaluated is jointly appointed in more than one department, or has significant teaching responsibility in an interdisciplinary program, there may be more than one evaluation committee.

Add: (d) Where a faculty member is appointed fully in an interdisciplinary position, composition of an evaluation committee and selection of the person who will function as head officer will be determined by agreement between the evaluatee and the dean.

Stern asked if it was possible for someone in two departments to have two evaluation committees and to be granted tenure in one department and not the other. Dean Cooney responded that tenure is granted by the university, not by departments. He also suggested that, although it has been very rare, department assignments have changed. He added that the purpose of section "d" is to clarify the situation for the one member of the faculty whose is currently appointed to an inter-disciplinary program.

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

Cannon said that the language in "d" implies that the evaluation committee is not created until the evaluation needs to be done, whereas Dean Cooney had said that the head officer should be identified at the time of appointment. Kris Bartanen said that language could be added to clarify that. Haltom said that perhaps ironing this out too early would "shackle the dean" too much. Taranovski agreed that the composition of evaluation committees does change; that one cannot organize these committees up front. Suzanne Barnett argued that the code should not say that this decision will be made at the time of appointment. Breitenbach said it is best to leave the proposed revision as it is; that both parties need to be reasonable at the time.

At this point Dean Cooney took a straw vote, asking how many preferred that the composition of the evaluation committee and selection of the person who will function as head officer be determined by agreement between the evaluatee and the dean, and how many preferred that all of this be determined by the dean in consultation with the evaluatee as had been suggested during discussion. The latter option received the most votes.

We considered proposed change #47, to Chapter III, Section 4,b:

Add: "Process governing progress of the evaluation from the department, school or program to the Advancement Committee: Transitional steps in the evaluation process enable the evaluatee to receive the departmental recommendation, to review the file, and to raise concerns about the fairness and adequacy of the evaluation."

There was no discussion.

We considered proposed change #48, to Chapter III, Section 4,b(1) and (1)(a):

Insert: "and the Advancement Committee"
Substitute: "evaluatee's" for "faculty"

"The departmental recommendation shall be forwarded by the head officer to the dean and the Advancement Committee, together with all written materials used in reaching that recommendation.

The criteria used in the deliberative process shall be stated in writing and also forwarded to the dean to become part of the evaluatee's file."

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.g is moved in part to III.b.(1) (d). See Change #50.
Current Code III.4.g is moved in part to III.4.a. (1) (c). See Change #43.*

We next considered proposed change #49, to Chapter III, Section 4,b(1)(c):

Add: The letter containing the departmental recommendation should report strengths and weaknesses of the evaluatee discussed during departmental deliberations and record significant differences in departmental opinion on the recommendation.

Barnett asked whether this language requires a report on weaknesses. The consensus response was that no, it does not. Taranovski said he was concerned about the word "discussed" because

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

it seemed not to allow a chair to summarize letters, etc. Cooney responded that, according to earlier code revisions already discussed, department deliberations are required, so that a chair's summary letter could not be based on letters. He said the process goes from letters to deliberation to recommendation.

We considered proposed change #50, to Chapter III, Section 4,b(2):

Substitute: "At the time the file and departmental recommendation are forwarded to the dean and the Advancement Committee, the head officer, in writing, shall provide the evaluee with:

- (a) *a list of those individuals participating in the department's deliberative process and those who submitted letters to the head officer;*
- (b) *a summary of the department's deliberations;*
- (c) *the departmental recommendation;*
- (d) *and, when applicable, notification that the chair has filed a minority recommendation.*
- (e) *The head officer also shall provide a faculty member being considered for tenure, or an evaluatee who has chosen confidential letters (see Chapter III, Sections 4.a.(1)(d) and 7), with a summary of the substance of letters submitted to the head officer."*

For (existing Code, Chapter III, Section 4, h): "At the time the file and departmental recommendations are forwarded to the dean and the Advancement Committee, the head officer, in writing, shall provide the faculty member who has chosen confidential letters (see Chapter III, Section 9, e) with: (1) a list of those individuals participating in the department's deliberations and those who submitted letters to the head officer; (2) a summary of the substance of the letters; and (3) a summary of the department's deliberations. The faculty member with non-confidential letters has access to the summaries identified in (1) and (3) above."

Martin Jackson said his understanding was that a summary of letters also needed to go to the Faculty Advancement Committee. Cooney said that Jackson was correct and that the CRC would need to address this.

Cannon said that the CRC needs to make sure that the language in section "a(2)" in proposed change #45 about who deliberates, etc., is consistent with the language here in proposed change #50.

Taranovski said that the proposed language seems not to require that letters being summarized even be discussed at all. Cooney responded that this section applies only to what goes to the evaluatee, not what goes to the FAC. He said that the proposed language is not a change.

Alva Butcher asked if the candidate even knows if there has been a minority recommendation. Droge responded no, not in the current code, which is why the new language is being proposed. Stern asked why the chair's minority recommendation is any more important than anyone else's minority recommendation. Cooney responded that if a non-chair disagrees, that sentiment should be included in the department summary.

University of Puget Sound Faculty Meeting Minutes
February 9, 1998, Page 5

Haltom, recognizing that the meeting was nearing its end, said that next time we should discuss (1) whether the head officer is truly so special that she or he should be required to submit a minority recommendation if he or she disagrees with the departmental recommendation, and (2) what constitutes "substance" in paragraph (e)."

We adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John M. Finney
Secretary of the Faculty.