

Faculty Senate  
McCormick Room, Library  
Minutes of the January 26, 2015 Meeting

**Present:**

Emelie Peine, Derek Buescher, Mike Segawa, Andrea Kueter, Kris Bartanen, Andrew Gardner, William Beardsley, Paige Maney, Chris Spalding, Nila Wiese, Zaixin Hong, Ariela Tubert, Jonathan Stockdale, Maria Sampen, Leslie Saucedo, & Bill Haltom

**Guests:**

Sherry Mondou, Brad Dillman

**Meeting called to order at 4:02 p.m.**

Chair Tubert welcomed new senators William Beardsley & Pierre Ly

**Presentation from the Budget Task Force**

Professor Brad Dillman summarized the written report presented to the senate in advance and characterized the recommendations as fair and sensible given the revenue and cost constraints within which the BTF works. Tuition dependency and price sensitivity constrain the former, while compensation as a significant component of the budget commands a large portion of the latter. The recommendations include a 4% salary pool increase for faculty and 3% pool increase for staff, with 6.3% increase in benefits. VP, Dean, and Senator Kris Bartanen saluted the process and participants, including recommendation of a 3.56% increase in tuition, the lowest in more than forty years. She encouraged senators to look to a new feature of the report, detailed appendices included to enhance the transparency of the budget process. VP of Finance and Administration Sherry Mondou answered a question to the effect that the university's transition to Premera a few years ago is unrelated to increases in costs of health insurance premiums; rather, overall medical trend and Puget Sound's costly claims history drives premiums up. Premera is currently losing money on Puget Sound, so that claims history means that Puget Sound should expect that any insurance plan will be more expensive in the future. The Budget Task Force has presented its recommendations to President Thomas who, after a comment period in which any campus member may offer input via [president@pugetsound.edu](mailto:president@pugetsound.edu) through February 9, will make his budget recommendation to the Board of Trustees.

**Election of new secretary of the Faculty Senate**

Senator Ly volunteered & was elected by acclamation after sighs of relief.

**Approval of minutes of the December 8, 2014 meeting**

M/S/P Approval of minutes of December 8, 2014 meeting, with emendation that "Sharron Briggs" be changed to "Shannon Briggs."

### **Updates from liaisons to standing committees**

Senator Sampen reported that Occupational Therapy faculty had raised concerns about support for student research by the University Enrichment Committee. Senator Sampen said she would attend a meeting between University Enrichment Committee and Occupational Therapy at the first meeting of Spring Semester [January 28, 2015] and will update the senate.

Senator Beardsley was appointed senate liaison to the Diversity Committee.

### **Updates from the ASUPS representative and the Staff Senate representative**

ASUPS will sponsor “Club Fest” on January 30, 2015 and will hold elections in March.

Chair Tubert recognized Andrea Kueter as the representative from the staff senate. The staff senate has been updated on the new performance review process for staff and, over the coming months, will discuss its intersection with merit raises for staff.

### **Discussion of PSC’s proposal of changes to the evaluation schedule**

Senator Beardsley introduced two proposed changes in the Faculty Code. The Professional Standards Committee in its 2013-2014 end-of-year report recommended that 1) reviews for three-year-associate professors resemble reviews of assistant professors in their 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> years, and 2) all full professors be permitted to elect streamlined reviews.

Two Proposed Code Changes

#### **From the PSC end of year report (2014):**

- i. 3<sup>rd</sup> –year associate review to follow mode of 1<sup>st</sup>- and 2<sup>nd</sup>- year assistant professor reviews.  
Parties involved in evaluation: evaluatee, head officer and dean
- ii. Following promotion to professor, faculty reviews will occur every five years and be streamlined. Parties involved in evaluation: evaluatee, head officer and the dean or a designated member of the FAC.

#### **Proposed implementation:**

##### **i. Associate professor**

- a. Strike “Persons in the rank of associate professor who are not candidates for tenure promotion and” from Chapter 3, section 5a of the Code.

Proposed change (as strike out):

Section 5 - Evaluation by Head Officer and Dean

- a. ~~Persons in the rank of associate professor who are not candidates for tenure or promotion and~~ professors in years 5, 15, 25, and 35 of service in that rank may elect to bypass the procedures for evaluation detailed in Chapter III, section 4 and have their next scheduled review conducted by the head officer and dean under the procedures described in this section. Instructors who have served 17 years or more in

that rank may establish an alternating schedule of full and alternative reviews in consultation with the head officer and the dean under the procedures described in this section.

- b. Add “An evaluation by the head officer shall also be made after each three year period of service for those at the rank of associate professor who are not candidates for tenure or promotion” to Chapter 3, section 2b of the Code.

Proposed change (additions in **bold**):

b. An evaluation by the head officer shall be made at the conclusion of each year for the first two years of the appointment of a faculty member without tenure, or earlier if a question of non-reappointment is at stake. **An evaluation by the head officer shall also be made after each three year period of service for those at the rank of associate professor who are not candidates for tenure or promotion.** A copy of the head officer's report shall be sent to the individual under evaluation and to the dean. A copy of the head officer's report shall be placed in the faculty member's evaluation file (Chapter III, Section 8). Except in cases of non-reappointment (Chapter II, Section 5), no further action is required.

## ii. Professor

Strike “in years 5, 15, 25 and 35 of service in that rank” from Chapter 3 section 5a of the Code.

Proposed change (as strike-out):

### Section 5 - Evaluation by Head Officer and Dean

a. Persons in the rank of associate professor who are not candidates for tenure or promotion and professors ~~in years 5, 15, 25, and 35 of service in that rank~~ may elect to bypass the procedures for evaluation detailed in Chapter III, section 4 and have their next scheduled review conducted by the head officer and dean under the procedures described in this section. Instructors who have served 17 years or more in that rank may establish an alternating schedule of full and alternative reviews in consultation with the head officer and the dean under the procedures described in this section.

Bartanen noted that the provision on associate professor needs to include language that allows the evaluatee to request a regular review. Beardsley will amend the document prior to the Faculty Meeting.

**M/S/P** That the senate endorse a change in the Faculty Code along the lines of 1 & 2 above.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:20pm.  
Minutes taken by Bill Haltom.

Respectfully submitted,  
Pierre Ly, secretary of the Faculty Senate