

Professional Standards Committee  
Minutes for March 19, 1996

Members present: W. Beardsley, G. Block, B. Goldstein, J. Riegsecker, K. Rousslang, T. Taranovski, L. Wood

L. Wood called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.  
Members approved the minutes of the last meeting.

The committee considered the letter of concern sent to them by a member of the faculty requesting our opinion regarding several issues.

1. "Is one, in fact denied tenure at the University of Puget Sound from the minute that the president has made that decision? If so, what is the role of the Board of Trustees."

*Faculty Code IV, 3* states:

**The status of tenure may be conferred only by action of the university Board of Trustees. Such action shall be upon recommendation of the president, following the completion of the evaluation procedure provided for in chapter III (p. 11) of this faculty code.**

Further, there is no distinct moment at which one is 'denied' tenure. Tenure is *granted* by the Board of Trustees upon recommendation by the President.

The time-line for a tenure decision is stipulated in *Faculty Code IV, 6*:

**The decision to grant tenure must be made not later than during a career faculty member's sixth year of career service at the University of Puget Sound. [.....] If tenure is *not granted* (our emphasis) by that time, the seventh year's contract shall be terminal.**

2. "What is the role of the appeals process? If the President's first word is the last word, how can the appeals process function as any type of *substantial* process for redress of violations of the *Faculty Code*?"

The appeals procedure detailed in the *Faculty Code III, 7* and *8*. *Faculty Code III, 8 k* and *i* includes a provision, under certain conditions, for the Board of Trustees to review an appeal. The "first word," namely the president's notification of her intention to not recommend tenure or promotion, is not necessarily "the last word." The granting or not granting of tenure is "the last word."

3. "Shouldn't our *Faculty Code* comply with the guidelines set down by AAUP?"

The *Code* does not address the AAUP guidelines. In order for the to comply , a revision of the *Code* would be required.

These opinions do not constitute an Interpretation of the *Code* .

Following the expression of the above opinion, the committee again took up a discussion of the grievances filed with the Dean's office. The members agreed that grievances that are filed in accordance with Chapter VI, section 1 b. are the only ones that become the responsibility of PSC. In particular, complaints that **include obligations conferred by Chapter I, Part F, and Chapters II, IV and V of this code** (*Faculty Code, VI, I b.*) are not grievances according to the *Code*. To become the property or responsibility of another body (say, a hearing board) they must be submitted through the appropriate channels, citing violations of the code that are not covered in *Faculty Code, VI, I b.*

The meeting was adjourned at 10:00.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Rousslang