

Faculty Senate Meeting  
March 23, 2020  
Minutes

**Senators Present:** Heather Bailey, Bill Beardsley, Laura Behling, Sara Freeman (Chair), Megan Gessel (Vice Chair), Alison Tracy Hale, Jairo Hoyos, Chris Kendall (Secretary), Jung Kim, Julia Looper, Tiffany MacBain, Andrew Monaco, Sarah Moore, Heather White.

**Visitors Present:** Jennifer Hastings, David Andresen, Landon Wade, Liz Collins, Greg Johnson

1. **Call to Order:** Freeman called the Senate to order at 12:01 pm. This is our first “virtual” meeting conducted on the “Google Meet” platform
2. **Announcements:** The Senate remembered our longtime friend and colleague George Mills, who passed away last week.
3. **Approval of Minutes:** M/S/P the minutes of 2/24/2020 as amended.

Discussion turned to general issues concerning note taking in the virtual format. Senators agreed that remarks typed in the “chat” feature would count as a regular contribution to the meeting and that a recording should be made to assist the note-taker in minute preparation and subsequently deleted.

4. **Update from Staff Senate:** Bailey had nothing new to report, noting that a great many of the concerns of our staff colleagues had been addressed by recent Administrative action.
5. **Updates from Liaisons to Standing Committees:**

CC: Freeman noted that she has heard the CC has approved the new Masters of Public Health Curriculum.

IRB: Moore reported that the Committee has informed all faculty and student researchers to stop all data collection during this period. Behling clarified that the IRB will examine proposals one by one to determine the extent to which data collection can be done over the phone or virtually. It is “in-person” data collection, requiring face-to-face contact, that has been stopped. Moore will stay in communication about further steps.

FAC: Gessel reported that she met with the FAC and they had several items of concern. For now, the major concern of the Committee centers on gaining sufficient nominations.

ASC: McBain reported concerning recent “stop-gap” changes to the credit/no credit policy. She also raised the issue of the Committee’s earlier, precorona, action concerning the pass/fail policy and asked the Senate whether we were still within the code mandated thirty working day window to put a hold on the action pending further consideration by the Senate and/or Faculty. Freeman suggested that we were still within the thirty day window and noted that Bulletin copy is not normally due until the end of April (and may be delayed).

Discussion turned back to the emergency credit/no credit policy. Kim asked Wade for clarification and he said that a student may elect the no-credit option for any and all of the courses for which they are registered this term. He said that a special email to students explaining their options and consequences is forthcoming, with special concern paid to the need of pre-medical students. Kendall made reference to a “change.org” petition circulating among students (with 1300 signatures so far) calling for an automatic universal pass for all spring 2020 courses. Behling stated that in her opinion the credit/no credit option was better for all students. There followed additional discussion concerning parallel moves made by other institutions.

PSC: Andressen reported that the Committee had worked through Spring Break preparing a document to be sent to faculty detailing options concerning future evaluations. He said that the Committee is committed to the utmost flexibility in these matters. For one thing, candidates will have the option to use or not to use student evaluations of teaching from the current term and may exercise this option even after the evaluations have been taken. Other steps considered would be to move evaluations usually conducted in the fall to later in the spring. The goal of all of these proposed changes is to maintain maximum flexibility for colleagues under evaluation. Discussion followed, including some consideration of the likelihood that Summer Courses would be offered remotely. Beardsley complimented the Committee on their diligence and commitment to fairness in this difficult time.

#### **6. Election Update:**

Kendall reminded the Senate that nominations were open for another week with the first round of voting coming the following Wednesday.

#### **7. Ad Hoc Committee on non-tenure track faculty (See Appendix B)**

Hastings and White discussed their report suggesting that non-tenure track faculty sometimes feel unappreciated for the important work that they do for the institution. The suggestions made in the report aim to increase job security and visibility. It was emphasized that none of the proposals require formal changes to the Faculty Code, although some would require action from the Provost’s office. The main suggestion would be to reserve the title “visiting” to those hired as nonrenewable leave replacements and to introduce a new designation, “term”, to cover all other contingent faculty. Many of the proposed changes will have to come as “recommendations” from the Senate to the Office of the Provost for review and implementation.

#### **8. Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned at 1:31

Respectfully,

Bill Beardsley  
Virtual note-taker

## Appendix A

**From:** Provost Laura Behling <provost@pugetsound.edu>

**Date:** Friday, March 20, 2020 at 4:55 PM

**To:** Maija S Petterson <mpetterson@pugetsound.edu>, Mimi Duncan <mimiduncan@pugetsound.edu>

**Cc:** President Isiaah Crawford <president@pugetsound.edu>, Office of the Dean of Students <dos@pugetsound.edu>, Office of the Registrar <registrar@pugetsound.edu>

**Subject:** Re: Universal Pass Puget Sound

Dear Mimi and Maija,

Thank you for your email and the thoughtfulness you've conveyed regarding this Spring's academic coursework and your classmates' wellbeing. I am sorry that the circumstances of COVID-19 have proven so disruptive to our campus community, and added significant stress for all students in the middle of a semester.

It is with all students in mind that the university made the decision, under the faculty's leadership, to provide flexibility to the Credit/No Credit policy, extend the withdrawal deadline, and continue the availability of the Incomplete option. Our goal was to strike the best possible balance between maintaining course expectations and standards, and accommodating all students.

The "universal pass" approach limits students' option to select what would be best for them in each of their courses and therefore doesn't serve the broadest possible range of our students in a way that may be suitable for their specific circumstances.

From an academic records standpoint, the "universal pass" approach would put many students at a significant disadvantage. For example:

1. There are students who are on academic sanctions and need to raise their GPAs. The "universal pass" proposal notably disadvantages them as it does not provide a way for them to do so.
2. There will likely be graduating seniors who need the opportunity to raise their GPA sufficiently in order to meet graduation requirements this term.
3. Equally critical, the "universal pass" model would penalize students who have a strong letter grade currently in their course(s) from benefiting in a strong GPA outcome, including those who may need a strong GPA for graduate school admission or

scholarships. I have already heard from students how much they appreciate the opportunity to still earn a letter grade should that be in their best interests.

The Credit/No Credit approach we have adopted does have the same advantage of signaling the student “passed” the course – if one were to opt for that grade in a course – since our guidelines establish a C- threshold for Credit/No Credit.

Our approaches—the Credit/No Credit option, the extended course withdrawal period, and the option for an incomplete—are intended to support our commitment to employ reasonable academic standards for courses and/or specific programs. A “universal pass” scenario across the board (especially where there is no minimum threshold for a passing grade) may suggest lowered expectations, which many faculty and students may find concerning.

In summary, the Credit/No Credit option does a number of important things for students, faculty, and the academic program at Puget Sound: (1) it provides students with a choice in each course to determine what grading option works best for them; (2) it mitigates student and faculty concerns about significantly lowering expectations; (3) it allow students with circumstances such as sanctions and/or graduation requirements to do what is best in their specific situation; (4) it provides adequate accommodation for students requiring academic accommodations; and (5) would not penalize academically high achieving students who want their grades to positively impact their GPA.

Our goal was to provide as much flexibility as we could for all Puget Sound students, given varied needs and circumstances, while ensuring particular academic standards that faculty are charged with as part of delivering the curriculum. I encourage all students to reach out to their academic advisor if they have questions about their own choices, given these more flexible academic policies.

Please know how much I appreciate your advocacy in support of your fellow students. I hope this message is responsive to your concerns, and I wish you well as you work to complete the semester in this very unsettling time.

Laura Behling

Laura L. Behling, Ph.D.  
Provost

**UNIVERSITY OF PUGET SOUND**

1500 N. Warner St. #1001  
Tacoma, WA 98416-1001  
T: 253.879.3205  
pugetsound.edu

**Confidentiality Notice:** This e-mail message may contain confidential or privileged information. If you have received it by mistake, please do not review, disclose, copy, or distribute it. Instead, please notify us immediately by replying to this message or telephoning us and delete it. Thank you.

**From:** Maija S Petterson <mpetterson@pugetsound.edu>  
**Date:** Friday, March 20, 2020 at 10:16 AM  
**To:** President Isiaah Crawford <president@pugetsound.edu>, Provost Laura Behling <provost@pugetsound.edu>, Office of the Dean of Students <dos@pugetsound.edu>, Office of the Registrar <registrar@pugetsound.edu>  
**Cc:** Mimi Duncan <mimiduncan@pugetsound.edu>  
**Subject:** Universal Pass Puget Sound

Dear University Administration, Staff, and Faculty

We would like to begin this email thanking the University for their dedication to the students and faculty, as well as keeping our safety and wellbeing the top priority, we understand the University had to make swift and difficult decisions to ensure that our campus community remains safe.

I am Mimi Duncan, currently a sophomore at the University majoring in history with a minor in Politics and Government. I also am serving as the Black Student Union President for this academic school year, as well as a representative for the Multi Identity Based Union.

I am Maija Petterson, and I am a current sophomore majoring in history with a minor in Latino Studies, I also have the pleasure of serving as the president of the Coalition of Multiracial and Biracial students and being a representative for the Multi Identity Based Union.

Together we have seen our campus's initial reactions to the pandemic as it first reached our beautiful state. These past weeks have been very strenuous for all of our campus, from our peers being forced to say goodbye to the communities they have created on the campus, to the athletics they have dedicated themselves to, to the art they have created, the jobs they relied on, and the friendships that they have made. This pandemic has not only altered our way of life but separated our campus community. As we felt disheartened, and recognized how detrimental these shifts are, we stumbled upon the No Fail Yale proposal. Our peers at Yale University are advocating for a Universal Pass for the remainder of the spring semester. We relate to the issues that they are also trying to tackle as we switch to online classes. We feel inspired by their proposal because we saw this as a way to guarantee every student's

success, and that they would not be discouraged by external pressures they cannot control during this troubling time. We have seen and heard from many of our peers on our own campus struggling with home security, financial security, and internet access. Seeing and hearing the tribulations our peers are going through motivated us to draft our own proposal, the Universal Pass Puget Sound. We drafted one that we felt fit the logger community, and we released it over social media along with the [Universal Pass Petition](#) through [www.change.org](http://www.change.org) to gauge student interest. We have been met with overwhelming support, gaining over 500 signatures in the first two hours. We have also heard more students' testimonies on why the Universal Pass would fit our university. We wanted to share a few from the comments section on the petition:

"I'm signing this because as someone with ADHD and other learning difficulties, I know that outside class participation will be extremely hard for me. Without in-person communication and additional help with assignments I will likely have a hard time completing assignments effectively and on time. While the University is doing everything, it can to help support students; for some, simply being away from the classroom will have a detrimental effect on their ability to learn. Additionally, as a senior who's about to graduate and go into the real world, this time is extremely troubling as the grades that I receive now may impact whether I even graduate this summer." - Thomas

"I'm signing because I know my GPA will take a hit with online classes. Many people are not in spaces that foster a good learning environment. With the virus being a problem in many households, it is not fair to expect students to do well in this current time. Personally, the stress that I cannot go home does not make it any easier for me to do classes when I know my family is highly at risk." - Jade

"My daughter, fortunately, has a safe and healthy home and decent technology but still has serious issues with hearing/communicating during online classes. This situation will simply not allow her to accomplish her best work this semester."- Rebecca

These are only a few testimonies that we have received regarding the proposed Universal Pass. We currently have 1,148 signatures but that number is still rising. We have both been very surprised by the growing amount of support and passion behind the idea, and it is a testament to how the logger community can come together. While we understand that letter grades are important and can showcase students' achievement, a universal pass, or something similar, would guarantee a passing credit instead of a credit/no credit. This means no student would be left behind or suffer unfairly. We are concerned about the external factors that students are facing, and we are hoping that as a university we can continue to support students through boosting their interest in continuing to learn and engage in academics instead of inappropriately being focused on their letter grade, rather than the substance of their education.

Our proposal has three main points. The first being how a Universal Pass differs from a credit/no credit option. As stated earlier the Universal Pass would guarantee every student passes and receives a credit for their classes this semester. A credit/no credit option does not

and leaves many students at a disadvantage for their continued studies. Our second point is about students in high risk situations. Students with limited resources (food insecurity, unstable housing, lack of internet access) will be at a major disadvantage that could affect their academics drastically. The proposed Universal Pass system would reduce the stress between choosing academics over personal/familial safety, health, and well-being. And our third main point is how students will stay motivated with a Universal Pass system, we know that the students on our campus are dedicated and motivated to succeed in every way. The Universal Pass allows them to focus on their classwork in their new environments without the undue focus or fear about the GPA, ultimately allowing students to fully engage in course work.

As the petition gained a larger following, students in the graduate program reached out to us with questions about their core classes and how they would factor in. As sophomores, we are not familiar with the grading system in the graduate program. However, we wanted to note that the No Fail Yale proposal has a section dedicated to their graduate and medical schools. As more students reached out, we decided it was time to turn over the information we have gathered over the last few days and present our proposal to the University.

We are urging the University to consider the Universal Pass, or something similar, as an option to further support students during this difficult and unprecedented time. We believe this will be the best way to support every student as well as guarantee every student has a successful and valuable semester.

Attached is our proposal for the Universal Pass Puget Sound and the No Fail Yale document. We have also included a link to our petition.

We wanted to thank the University for putting the health and safety of students as a top priority during this time. We are hoping you consider the Universal Pass, and we would be happy to discuss this with you.

Mimi Duncan  
University of Puget Sound Class '22  
Black Student Union President

Maija Petterson  
University of Puget Sound Class '22  
Coalition of Multiracial and Biracial Students President  
Multi Identity Based Union Representative

**Report of the *Ad hoc* Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty**

**March 6, 2020**

The University of Puget Sound Faculty Senate convened an *ad hoc* committee to explore “the status of non-tenure line and non-ongoing clinical-line faculty members” (May 9, 2018 Faculty Senate minutes). The *ad hoc* committee initially convened November 20, 2019, and worked through March 6, 2020. The Senate presented four specific charges to the committee:

1. Gather further information, as needed, to provide a portrait of the contributions made by non-tenure track faculty to the curriculum as a whole and specifically to the core curriculum.
2. Gather and evaluate recommendations for best practices from relevant external and internal sources.
3. Recommend best practices for the appointment, re-appointment, and evaluation of contingent faculty across the university, with attention to provisions that would address job security, protect academic freedom, facilitate inclusion in academic citizenship and governance, and ensure equitable opportunities for promotion and advancement.
4. This report on best practices should also address recommended changes to the faculty code and future charges to standing committees as necessary to follow up on the committee’s report.

A note on terminology: throughout this report the term “contingent faculty” denotes full time, non-tenure track faculty members teaching at University of Puget Sound.

The *ad hoc* Committee

*Committee Members*

As delineated by the Faculty Senate, the *ad hoc* “committee will be comprised of two tenure-line faculty and two faculty in non-tenure track positions, who will work with Associate Deans Julie Christoph and Sunil Kukreja and a senate liaison.” The committee members include:

CHAIR: Jennifer Hastings: Professor; Physical Therapy; was first employed at Puget Sound in a visiting assistant professor position (sabbatical replacement) then in clinical-line position for five years. After completing her PhD, Jennifer returned to Puget Sound in a clinical line for three years, moved to tenure-line with appointment to program director, and was promoted to professor prior to being granted tenure.

Julie Christoph: Professor; English (2002-present); Associate Academic Dean (2018-present); English department has seen loss of four instructor positions; supportive/*ex officio* role.

Alyce DeMarais: Professor; Biology; came to Puget Sound in 1999 as an tenure-line Assistant Professor. After being granted tenure, Alyce served as an Associate Academic Dean (2005 - 2012). After returning to the Biology Department, Alyce served as department chair. Alyce recorded minutes of all meetings of the *ad hoc* committee.

David Hanson: Visiting Instructor; Spanish (2011-present); has taught 100- and 200-level Spanish courses full-time for the past nine years and also currently serves as an academic advisor.

Gregory Johnson: Visiting Assistant Professor (2006; 2009-Present; Thomas A. Davis Teaching Award 2018); Biology; has taught numerous courses servicing university core, department majors (100, 200, & 300 level). Greg serves as an academic advisor; serves as a member of HPAC committee, and the Bioethics Advisory Committee. Greg has served on 11 faculty hiring committees including as a Diversity Liaison; served on three staff hiring committees; participated in Bookends (2019); served on numerous Biology department committees; and participated in numerous Biology department workshops.

Heather White: Visiting Assistant Professor, Religion and Gender and Queer Studies (started in 2015); Interim Director of GQS (Spring 2020); Elected member of the Faculty Senate and the Senate liaison to the *ad hoc* committee; active committee member

#### *Rationale for the Work of the ad hoc Committee*

It is our hope to maintain and support academic professionalism by the faculty at the University of Puget Sound. When comparing the number of contingent faculty at Puget Sound relative to other undergraduate institutions and the Northwest Five (see [Appendix D: Synthesis of External Information on Best Practices](#)), this university has done well to resist the casualization of faculty labor. Puget Sound has maintained tenure and tenure-track faculty numbers, while employing a number of ongoing contingent faculty who provide meaningful work through teaching in the university core, teaching upper division courses in majors, advising students, serving on standing committees, serving on ad hoc committees, serving on department committees, providing curriculum development, conducting research and scholarship with students, representing the university at conferences and workshops, amongst other activities ([Appendix B: Non-tenure Track Faculty Survey Report](#)).

Puget Sound, however, falls short in providing clear communication to contingent faculty. Considering the Mission Statement and Core Values of the University of Puget Sound including: I “community [that] maintains a strong commitment to teaching excellence,” “liberate each person’s fullest intellectual and human potential,” “Collegiality – We genuinely respect each other and collaborate with honesty, integrity, and openness for the common good,” we were guided by five core ideas:

- A. *Treat all faculty regardless of tenure or tenure-track status with dignity.*
- B. *Provide more year-to-year security to ongoing term faculty.*

- C. *Clarify opportunities for term faculty to receive feedback from faculty peers and supervisors through the evaluation process.*
- D. *Clarify opportunities for term faculty to receive support for professional development both on campus and via access to funding sources for conference attendance and workshops.*
- E. *Reduce confusion about the role of “visiting” faculty on campus.*

The clearest rationale for the ad hoc committee’s work comes from the Jackson Term Faculty Positions Proposal and the report to the faculty senate prepared by Alisa Kessel on meetings with non-tenure line faculty, which demonstrate:

- The university relies on a set of non-tenure-line, full-time faculty positions, which supplement tenure-line positions in addressing the university’s ongoing curricular needs.
- These faculty positions are titled as visiting and yet they extend beyond the short-term, temporary needs expected of visitation positions that fill sabbatical replacements and/or address short-term grant funded projects.
- The ongoing need for faculty in these positions is structural. Their teaching in part fills a gap created by the discontinuation of instructor lines, a decision made by the university in the mid-1990s. Only some of these positions have been converted to tenure-track lines. Faculty in these positions also address the demand for courses in new and expanding disciplines. The faculty in these positions also contribute disproportionately to the needs of the core curriculum and to introductory-level courses. (See appendices to the [Faculty Senate Charges](#))
- While many ongoing visiting faculty address these curricular needs with excellent teaching, they do so without the same level of job security and institutional support provided to tenure-line and tenured faculty.
- Many of the faculty in these positions have reported that this lack of support creates an added burden; it contributes to high levels of anxiety about job security and a feeling of institutional disinterest even as they are being asked to invest in the university. (see [report prepared by Alisa Kessel](#) and [Non-tenure Track Faculty Survey Report](#))
- Thus, even as Puget Sound has largely resisted the trend toward the casualization of academic labor (see [Appendix D: Synthesis of External Information on Best Practices](#)), we nonetheless have maintained a de-facto two-tier faculty system that operates without transparent acknowledgement and oversight.
- The committee’s work has been to acknowledge the various continuing faculty positions that exist outside of tenure/ tenure-track faculty and to provide transparent acknowledgement and oversight for these positions.
- The lack of transparency and support for ongoing non-tenure track faculty is one of the higher education’s most pressing and frequently discussed issues, and an increasing number of scholarly societies have called for changes.
- The problems that contribute to the added stress and burdens of contingency are also tied in with the need for a first-year and core curriculum that better supports and retains our students.

## *Committee Process*

We began our work by reading all available Puget Sound documentation applying to our charges. The documentation we reviewed is available in [Appendix A: Background Information](#). Additionally, we sought and received confirmation from the Professional Standards Committee that our plan of action was permitted within the Faculty Code. That plan hinged on the understanding that: (1) the *ad hoc* committee could recommend new categories of faculty at Puget Sound without requiring a change in the Faculty Code language and (2) while faculty may provide input on the creation of faculty contracts, the details of those contracts are dictated by the provost under the guidance of the Faculty Code.

From the PSC: “The PSC met and we concur with point 1., that new categories of employment can be created.” [email communication to Jennifer Hastings 12/09/19]

From the PSC: “With regard to point 2., faculty may provide input to the creation of contracts, but contract specifics are the purview of the administration and thus do not necessitate ongoing guidance from faculty (i.e., the Provost can solely dictate the terms of a contract), as bound by Faculty Code and By-Laws.” [email communication to Jennifer Hastings 12/09/19]

The *ad hoc* committee then used the four Faculty Senate charges as a framework for the committee’s activities. Early in the process, we created a draft document entitled “Ways to be a faculty member at Puget Sound” (= “[Working Document](#)”). We used the Working Document as a framework for developing policy regarding categories of faculty. Our intent was to build our best recommendations from the Puget Sound perspective, informed by best practices gleaned from external sources, through consensus of the *ad hoc* committee.

We reviewed the draft Working Document in conjunction with the Faculty Code to determine any points of conflict. We inserted Code citations in the Working Document to indicate areas of compliance with the Faculty Code for each policy recommendation. By consensus, the *ad hoc* committee worked to address the Faculty Senate charges in ways that did not require revision of the Faculty Code.

### Charge 1: Gather Further Information

To address the first charge, “Gather further information, as needed, to provide a portrait of the contributions made by non-tenure track faculty to the curriculum as a whole and specifically to the core curriculum,” we developed a survey and invited all full time non-tenure track (NTT) faculty (= “contingent faculty”) to complete the survey in early December 2019. A reminder

message was sent out two weeks after the online survey was posted. See [Appendix B](#) for a summary of our findings and [Appendix C](#) for a copy of the survey.

The survey responses confirmed analysis from previous reports that indicate contingent faculty members are contributing substantially to the curricula at Puget Sound, including teaching in the Core Curriculum. In addition, contingent faculty members contribute to service at Puget Sound, including academic advising. While contingent faculty members are fully integrated into the Puget Sound faculty, concerns about stability of these positions were paramount.

### Charge 2: Identify Best Practices

Our second charge directed us to “Gather and evaluate recommendations for best practices from relevant external and internal sources.” To this end we investigated regional and peer institutions as well as national best practice models and professional organizations for academic teaching. See [Appendix D](#) for a summary of our findings. In general, best practices include:

- Clear designations of ongoing faculty positions.
- Clearly delineated and ongoing evaluation policies.
- Clearly defined reappointment and promotion timelines and policies.

### Charge 3: Recommend Best Practices

The third charge directed the committee to “Recommend best practices for the appointment, re-appointment, and evaluation of contingent faculty across the university, with attention to provisions that would address job security, protect academic freedom, facilitate inclusion in academic citizenship and governance, and ensure equitable opportunities for promotion and advancement.” We directed the bulk of our committee work to addressing this charge.

Through our discussions and consensus building, we revised the Working Document to reflect best practices and to suggest policy for Puget Sound within the framework of the Faculty Code “...for the appointment, re-appointment, and evaluation of contingent faculty across the university, with attention to provisions that would address job security...and ensure equitable opportunities for promotion and advancement.” We note that all Puget Sound faculty members are, through the Faculty Code, protected in terms of academic freedom and “...inclusion in academic citizenship and governance” as indicated by:

*Faculty Code, Chapter 1, Section 2: “ Non-tenure line faculty members’ roles, rights and responsibilities are the same as tenure line faculty as described in Chapter 1 of the Faculty Code with exceptions as noted in this code.”*

By consensus, the committee accepted that aspects of the third charge needed to be addressed by the creation of a new category of faculty member and the development of transparent policies pertaining to how these faculty positions are distributed, evaluated, and terminated. We note that most of our recommendations confirm those developed in Martin Jackson’s 2018

proposal ([See appendices to committee charges](#)) regarding term faculty positions at Puget Sound.

The document below introduces this new category of faculty positions and clarifies the distinctions of existing categories of faculty positions.

## **University of Puget Sound Faculty Positions or Ways to be a Member of the Faculty [2-24-20]**

**Note:** relevant sections of the Faculty Code are highlighted in *blue* font; relevant sections of the Faculty Bylaws are highlighted in *green* font. Some language in this document is taken from the proposal developed by Martin Jackson (2018).

### **Tenure Line Faculty**

Tenure line faculty positions are continuing positions that exist in the undergraduate and graduate departments and programs at Puget Sound [*Faculty Code, Chapter I, Section 1: “An appointment with tenure is continuous”*]. The number of tenure line faculty positions within the university is set by the Board of Trustees and unlikely to change.

Once appointed in a tenure line position the individual must stand for tenure after five years of service. If tenure is not granted the individual will receive a terminal contract for one academic year. [*Faculty Code, Chapter II, Section 4- defines the timeline for informing and individual of no reappointment*]. Evaluation standards and procedures are defined in the Faculty Code.

### **Clinical Line Faculty**

The graduate/professional schools have clinical line faculty positions that are continuing positions within the schools. The faculty of the graduate/professional schools are subject to the rules of external accreditation bodies as well as the Faculty Code. Each graduate/professional school will have a written policy defining evaluation standards and role expectations for their clinical and tenure line faculty positions.

### **Term Faculty Positions without Tenure**

This new category of faculty positions at Puget Sound will include the designations: Term Assistant Professor, Term Associate Professor, Term Professor, and Term Instructor. The main purpose of term faculty positions is to fill longer-term instructional needs not relating primarily to leave replacement. The Faculty Code allows for the creation of such a new type of faculty position.

*Faculty Code, Chapter I, Part B, Section 2: “Non-tenure-line faculty members are those appointed as instructor, adjunct faculty, visiting faculty, or other positions that might be*

*created [emphasis added]. Non-tenure-line faculty are appointed on a contract basis. Such contractual relations may continue indefinitely but shall not lead to tenure."*

*Faculty Code, Chapter I, Section 2: "Non-tenure line faculty members' roles, rights and responsibilities are the same as tenure line faculty as described in Chapter 1 of the Faculty Code with exceptions as noted in this code."*

Term faculty positions are established after a request from a department based upon documented need. The request process for a new term position or renewal of a current term position will include these steps:

- The department/program sends a written request to the associate academic dean. The request must include rationale based on analysis of recent enrollment data and projection for enrollments in relevant courses through the requested term; the teaching, scholarship, and service expectations for the position; the position requirements; and the anticipated duration of the position.

*Faculty Code, Chapter I, Part D, Section 1 "All faculty members have responsibilities to the university community in the areas of teaching, advising and departmental service. Tenure-line faculty are also responsible for university service and to their particular disciplines in scholarly activities."*

- The associate academic dean reviews the request and consults with the department/program as needed before forwarding a recommendation to the provost.
- The provost reviews the request for approval and sets the rank of the term position.

*Faculty Code, Chapter II, Section 1c: "Schools, departments and programs shall develop criteria for all faculty appointments and work closely with the president and the dean in developing policies in this area."*

If a search is needed to fill a new or renewed term position, search and appointment processes will follow the current processes for visiting faculty positions in the Faculty Recruitment Guidelines with the appropriate addition of "Term Faculty Positions" terminology. The initial appointment will include language that continuation of the appointment beyond the first year is contingent upon a satisfactory evaluation.

Term faculty position contracts will continue for set periods. These positions are renewable, but do not lead to tenure. Initial appointments will be made for three years.

*Faculty Code, Chapter II, Section 2: "initial appointments may be one, two or three years."*

At the end of two years of the initial appointment, the chair will consult with the associate academic dean regarding continuation of the position; the position may renew or be discontinued. The individual in the position will be informed of the status of the position. If the position is discontinued, the associate academic dean will notify the faculty member in writing at

the earliest possible time, but not later than June 30<sup>th</sup> preceding the final contract year and the third year contract will be a terminal contract.

*Faculty Code, Chapter II, Section 4 c. "...the dean will notify the faculty member in writing at the earliest possible time, and in accordance with the following standards...not later than June 30 preceding the final contract year, after two or more consecutive years of academic service."*

If the position is renewed, the individual **may** be reappointed for a 3-year or a 5-year contract depending upon the needs of the department/program **or** the position may be opened to hire new personnel:

- Five-year contracts will be offered to an individual who has a positive evaluation during completion of their initial 3-year contract and the needs of the department/program dictate a 5-year contract. A meritorious individual may be offered a 3-year contract if the status of the position is so deemed.

*Faculty Code, Chapter III, Section 2a "Evaluation shall occur prior to all decisions."*

- The decision to reappoint, or not, is based upon the faculty evaluation completed in the spring of the second year of the initial contract (see Evaluation section below).
- If the decision is made **not** to reappoint the individual in the position, even though the position is renewing, the associate academic dean will notify the faculty member in writing at the earliest possible time, not later than June 30<sup>th</sup> preceding the final contract year, that the remaining year of the contract is terminal.

Subsequent renewal of the position will follow the same guidelines. If the position is renewed, the individual may be offered a 3-year or 5-year contract depending upon the needs of the department/program or the position may be opened to hire new personnel. The decision to reappoint an individual in the position, or not, is based upon the faculty evaluation completed in the spring of the second year of a 3-year contract or the spring of the fourth year of a 5-year contract (see Evaluation section below).

*Faculty Code, Chapter II, Section 4 c. "...the dean will notify the faculty member in writing at the earliest possible time, and in accordance with the following standards...not later than June 30 preceding the final contract year, after two or more consecutive years of academic service."*  
*"The provisions of this section shall also apply to faculty members who are full-time instructors except those holding appointments as visiting faculty."*

*Faculty Code, Chapter I, Section 2 : " Non-tenure line faculty members' roles, rights and responsibilities are the same as tenure line faculty as described in Chapter 1 of the Faculty Code with exceptions as noted in this code." "Other positions that might be created" do not have listed exceptions in the code.*

We note that the term faculty appointments allow term faculty members to be eligible to serve on the Faculty Senate and in other university service appointments.

*The Faculty Bylaws state that faculty shall elect to a two year term “from among its instructional staff” a Senate Chairperson. (Article III sec. 1 C) and shall elect for three year terms from among its instructional staff ... senators. (Article III Sec. 1 D).*

*Eligibility to be elected to the Senate are full-time members of the non-retired instructional staff classified as follows: Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, Instructor. (Article IV Sec. 6a.) Standing committees are appointed from the members of the instructional staff eligible to vote for senators. (Bylaws Article II sec. 1 and 3)*

### *Evaluation*

Term Faculty Members will be evaluated consistent with the standards and procedures in the *Faculty Code, Chapter III*. For an initial appointment (3-year contract) an evaluation by the head officer shall be made at the conclusion of the first year (*Faculty Code, Chapter III, Section 2 b*). The evaluation at the conclusion of the second year will be a full departmental evaluation. and must be concluded within the spring semester to allow the decision of reappointment to be made before the June 30<sup>th</sup> notification deadline.

Term Faculty with a reappointment 5-year contract will have a full departmental evaluation in the conclusion of the fourth year which must be completed within the spring semester to allow for the decision of reappointment to be made before the June 30<sup>th</sup> notification deadline.

*Faculty Code Chapter III Section 2a “Evaluation shall occur prior to all decisions.”*

*The Faculty Bylaws state that the duties of the Faculty Advancement Committee shall be to “make recommendations to the President concerning **all reappointments**. (Article V Sec. 6 C. e. 1)*

### *Salary and Promotion*

Initial placement on the faculty salary scale will be determined by the usual practice of granting credit for prior experience with one step for each year of full-time teaching at the college level after earning the relevant required degree and one step for every two years of full-time post-doctoral fellowship experience. After the initial year, a term faculty member will advance in step each year through the seventh step in the relevant rank.

Term faculty members will be eligible for promotion with successful evaluation at reappointment.

## Visiting Faculty

Visiting positions are **temporary** and are defined either by the need for leave **replacement** (sabbatical, medical, maternity etc.) or positions created by time limited grants/external funding. Visiting positions may be one, two, or three years, based on need. Visiting positions do not renew.

- Visiting positions should be filled in consultation with the Associate Academic Dean/Provost and the department of the faculty member granted leave.
- Visiting faculty will receive a formal evaluation by the department head during the last month of appointment which will include assessment obtained from at least one teaching observation.

*Faculty Code, Chapter 1, section 2b “visiting faculty are **temporary** faculty members, who may be appointed visitors in any rank for a specified period.”*

*The Faculty Bylaws state that “no faculty members should be appointed to a committee during the first year of service” (Article V Sec. 4 B. d.) Thus, Visiting Faculty members in leave replacement positions should not be appointed to standing committees.*

### Charge 4: Follow-up Work

The fourth charge reminded us that “This report on best practices should also address recommended changes to the faculty code and future charges to standing committees as necessary to follow up on the committee’s report.” As we note in this report, all recommended changes fall within the tenets of the Faculty Code.

The following action items should be addressed by the provost and associate academic deans:

- Establish and publish required criteria that must be included in a **request** for a term faculty position; such as, historical need, forecasting for the documentation of need and perhaps for the establishment of the role expectations.
- Implement a transition plan as soon as possible:
  - Determine an appropriate timeline for departments/programs to provide the data to support term faculty positions that currently exist.
  - A one-time **correction of nomenclature** of all current faculty with a “visiting” title who do not fit the above definition of Visiting Faculty to “Term” will be required.
  - These corrected “Term” positions will need to be confirmed as **renewed with a set contract duration**.

We provide the following observations for further discussion:

Given that an opening in a tenure-line position creates a moment of assessment for the university in consideration of which department/program is best served by the assignment of the tenure-line position, the committee recommends that the provost consider the following policy:

If the department/program where the tenure-line will be assigned has a history of an ongoing non-tenure track faculty position that has been continuously filled by an individual who is qualified for a tenure-line position and has been re-appointed at least once, the provost may offer to appoint this individual to a tenure-line position (starting without tenure). If the department/program needs more staffing or specialized knowledge a term position can be requested.

Rationale: The existence of a policy, such as this, would go a long way for supporting the morale of individuals who have a long duration of service with the university. A policy, such as this, would conserve university resources.