

**University of Puget Sound
Faculty Meeting Minutes
April 28, 1998**

President Pierce called the meeting to order at 4:04 p.m. Fifty voting members of the faculty were present.

Minutes of the April 1, 1998, April 8, 1998, and April 21, 1998 faculty meetings were approved as distributed.

President Pierce reported that a trustee has endowed a teaching excellence award which he would like to be called the President's Excellence in Teaching Award. Currently the University is able to make such awards on a short term basis. This endowment will enable us to give one such award annually in perpetuity.

President Pierce asked Dean Cooney to preside during discussion of the motion made by David Droge at the April 21, 1998 faculty meeting **"to adopt the revisions to the *Faculty Code* as proposed by the Code Revision Committee and as contained in the document circulated to faculty April 13, 1998."** Dean Cooney explained that the motion was on the floor for discussion, and that amendments to the motion were in order. Parliamentarian for today's meeting, Gary Peterson, added that amendments to parts of the code not already amended by the current motion were not in order.

Grace Kirchner M/S/(vote reported later) "to substitute the existing language of the *Faculty Code* for the proposed new language in the following four passages and to defer consideration of these four passages until phase 2 of the *Code* revision procedure.

Add Existing

**Ch. II, Part A, Section 4
Ch. II, Part B, Section 3
Ch. III, Section 4e
Ch. VI, Section 4b(9)**

Remove Proposed

**Ch. II, Section 4
Ch. III, Section 3e
Ch. III, Section 4a(2)
Ch. VI, sections 4c(9) and
4c(10)"**

Kirchner explained that a review of the minutes of the faculty meetings in which these changes were discussed indicated they were controversial in nature, making them more appropriately considered in Phase II of the code revision procedures adopted by the faculty October 8, 1997. Nancy Bristow added that we should not rush consideration of changes on which we may not agree, and that removing these changes from the motion allows us to complete a portion of our work with the code this spring, so that "we can enter the fall semester with focus on a more finite agenda."

Doug Cannon, observing that much work on these four changes had already been completed, suggested they could be considered during an intermediary stage of code revision, between Phases I and II. Kirchner and Bristow responded that the October 8, 1997 language describing the code review process says that substantive code changes are to be considered in Phase II.

Suzanne Barnett asked if the Code Review Committee (CRC) did not in fact believe that these four changes were clarifications. She wondered if the code would be unclear with these four changes removed. Droge responded that the CRC felt the changes were appropriate, but CRC members noticed that the changes were controversial in faculty meetings. Droge expressed concern that there is no clear mechanism for moving from Phase I to Phase II revisions to the code.

University of Puget Sound Faculty Meeting Minutes
April 28, 1998, Page 2

Harry Velez Quinones said he felt it was odd that we could not deal with these four controversies now. He said it was tiring to delay consideration after having discussed them already. He said he would like to move forward with debating them. John Hanson disagreed, saying that Phase I code changes should not include controversial, substantive issues.

Two persons requested a paper ballot. Kirchner's motion then passed.

We returned to discussion of the main motion. **Hans Ostrom M/S/P "to remove Academic Vice President and from the proposed revision to I,C,2,f, so that the revised sentence reads 'These guidelines must be approved by the Professional Standards Committee and the Dean of the University (hereinafter referred to as the dean).'"**

Bill Beardsley said he was in favor of the motion because "Academic Vice President" is a president's version of structure and might change and shouldn't be written into the code. President Pierce explained that she added the Academic Vice President title, not to signal a restructuring, but to signal to constituents that the dean really is the number two person in the university. She said she supported the motion. **The Ostrom motion then passed on a voice vote.**

Bill Haltom then began a discussion of whether the CRC should do "housekeeping" on the revised code by adding or removing commas and making other minor editorial changes. Bartanen said the CRC would need to add appropriate cross-references now that the four proposed changes have been eliminated. She suggested the CRC could also check commas. Beardsley objected, saying commas may be substantively meaningful. Haltom agreed that cosmetic changes could be risky and change meaning. In response to a query from Dean Cooney, the assembly agreed by consensus that housekeeping could occur so long as no words or commas were changed. Haltom asked if the CRC would accept word change suggestions for consideration by the faculty later. Bartanen noted that these minor kinds of changes are what the CRC has been working on all year. John Riegsecker asked if the CRC even exists anymore. Dean Cooney responded that no, it does not, since Phase I of the code review process is complete and no further charge has been given to this committee.

Haltom distributed a document containing several amendments he planned to make to the main motion. He declined to propose his first amendment after asking Dean Cooney if he would rule it out of order and learning that yes, dean Cooney would. **Haltom then M/S/vote reported later "to amend II,4,a by returning to the original wording of II,A,1,c and adding the word "general," to read: 'Schools, departments and programs shall develop criteria for all faculty appointments and work closely with the president and the dean in developing general policies in this area.'"**

Haltom argued that returning to the original language means that faculty are participants in the process of defining faculty appointments. Barnett asked if the CRC proposed revision did not accomplish the same objective. Haltom thought it moved faculty involvement down a level. Barnett asked if this were not the kind of discussion that should have taken place during step 2 of Phase I. She asked why we could not simply pass the main motion and then revise it if necessary. Riegsecker pointed out that II,A,1,c is no longer in the code. Dean Cooney responded that that was correct, but that consideration of Haltom's motion could proceed because the CRC did originally modify this part of the code. **Haltom's motion then passed on a voice vote.**

Haltom M/S/vote reported later “to delete from amended III,4,(3),b,(1),(c) the sentence ‘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.’”

Cannon objected to the motion, saying that we discussed this issue thoroughly already and should not be taking it up again. Haltom responded that the rules allow us to depart from the baseline document now. He said the current code that does not contain the sentence allows department discussion to be free flowing. He said that individuals can change their minds and be convinced they are wrong, so that insisting that all strengths and weaknesses discussed be reported in a department letter is improper. He said it is best to let the department decide what the deliberation yielded. Cannon reiterated his point that this is a replay of discussion in an earlier faculty meeting, and that it is offensive to have to go over these “minutiae” again.

Haltom’s motion then passed on a voice vote.

Haltom M/ruled out of order “to add the underlined words in III,4,i, to read: If, within ten (10) working days of reviewing the file (non-confidential letters) or reviewing the file and receiving the head officer’s report (confidential letters), the individual faculty member feels that he or she has been unfairly or inadequately evaluated by the department, school or program or inaccurately or unfairly referred to or described by any member of the department, school or program, that individual has the right to notify, in writing, the Advancement Committee. This written notification shall be included in the evaluatee’s file. The Advancement Committee will inform the department, school, or program, or in the case of an open evaluation file those individuals whose letters have been challenged, that they may, if they desire, read the challenge and write a response; any written responses shall be included in the evaluatee’s file. Notification of challenge and response are limited to one round. The processing of a claim of unfair or inadequate treatment shall be done under Chapter III, Section 4.c.(4).

Dean Cooney said he believed this change extended the code to include a substantive issue not already discussed, and that he therefore had to rule the motion out of order. Gary Peterson expressed the parliamentarian’s view that the motion deals with description only, and is not an extension of substance, and therefore was in order. President Pierce said that the motion moved away from department assessments to multiple individual assessments, something that is new and not desirable. Haltom said what he intended to do was to “tease out” the meaning of the original wording. **Dean Cooney thanked the parliamentarian for his interpretation, but reminded us that he himself had to make the decision one way or the other and that he still found the motion to be out of order, and so ruled.**

Barnett M/S/F to close debate on the main motion. The motion was not debatable and failed on a hand vote.

Haltom M/ruled out of order “to make the following changes indicated by strikethroughs and underlining in III,4,i, to read: ‘If, within ten (10) working days of reviewing the file (non-confidential letters) or reviewing the file and receiving the head officer’s report (confidential letters), the individual faculty member feels that he or she has been unfairly or inadequately evaluated by the department, school or program, that individual has the right to notify, in writing, the Advancement Committee. This written notification shall be included in the evaluatee’s file. The Advancement Committee will inform the department, school, or program, or in the case of an open evaluation file those individuals whose

letters have been challenged, that they may, if they desire, read the challenge and write a response; any written responses shall be included in the evaluatee's file. **Notification of challenge and response are is limited to one round, but the evaluatee must be permitted a response to any new information inserted in the file. The processing of a claim of unfair or inadequate treatment shall be done under Chapter III, Section 4.c.(4)."**

Dean Cooney ruled that the motion extends the code to include an additional round of response. He said that notwithstanding any personal views he might have about the motion, he had to rule it out of order, and he did so.

Haltom M/S/P "to make the following changes indicated by strikethroughs and underlining in III,4,i, to read: 'If, within ten (10) working days of reviewing the file (non-confidential letters) or reviewing the file and receiving the head officer's report (confidential letters), the individual faculty member feels that he or she has been unfairly or inadequately evaluated by the department, school or program, that individual has the right to notify, in writing, the Advancement Committee. This written notification shall be included in the evaluatee's file. The Advancement Committee will inform the department, school, or program, or in the case of an open evaluation file those individuals whose letters have been challenged, that they may, if they desire, read the challenge and write a response; any written responses shall be included in the evaluatee's file. ~~Notification of a~~**Challenge and response are limited to one round. The processing of a claim of unfair or inadequate treatment shall be done under Chapter III, Section 4.c.(4)."** The motion passed on a voice vote.

Haltom M/S/P "to make the following changes indicated by strikethroughs and underlining in III,5,a,3, to read: 'Any response(s) from the department, school, or program; the Advancement Committee; or the president shall be submitted to the chairperson of the Professional Standards Committee within (10) working days of the respondent(s)' receipt of the list of alleged violations. The chairperson of the Professional Standards Committee and the chair of the hearing board may grant an extension for submission of a response if a respondent demonstrates, ~~due to circumstances beyond his or her control,~~ **that s/he was unable to take receipt of the list of alleged violations at the time they were provided by the evaluatee, due to circumstances beyond his or her control.**" The motion passed on a voice vote.

Haltom M/S/ "to make the following change indicated by underlining in III,5,a,3, to read: 'Any response(s) from the department, school, or program; the Advancement Committee; or the president shall be submitted to the chairperson of the Professional Standards Committee within (10) working days of the respondent(s)' receipt of the list of alleged violations. The chairperson of the Professional Standards Committee and the chair of the hearing board may grant an extension for submission of a response if a respondent demonstrates that s/he was unable to take receipt of the list of alleged violations at the time they were provided by the evaluatee, due to circumstances beyond his or her control. **Any respondent(s) who respond(s) must provide the evaluatee with a copy of the response.**"

President Pierce objected to including just the single underlined sentence without the additional language ("If the file is closed and confidential matters are raised in responses, the chairperson of the hearing board, once he or she has been elected, will be responsible for ruling on which passages in responses may be obscured or otherwise bowdlerized. The chairperson of the Professional Standards Committee shall confirm with the evaluatee the timely receipt of all

University of Puget Sound Faculty Meeting Minutes
April 28, 1998, Page 5

responses to the list of alleged violations.”) that Haltom had elected not to include in his motion because Dean Cooney had indicated he would rule it out of order if he had. She was concerned about maintaining the confidentiality of individual letters. Haltom responded that he felt that due process required even just the single sentence included in the motion. Dean Cooney, noting that our 5:30 ending time had arrived, suggested that we begin the next meeting with consideration of this motion. The assembly agreed by consensus.

We adjourned at 5:31 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John M. Finney
Secretary of the Faculty