

## Faculty Meeting Minutes

April 1, 1998

President Pierce called the meeting to order at 4:06 p.m. Fourteen voting members of the faculty were present.

Minutes of the March 11, 1998 and March 24, 1998 faculty meetings had not yet been distributed, so approval was deferred until the next meeting.

There were no announcements.

President Pierce reported that the School of Education was visited earlier this week by an NCATE accreditation evaluation team, which made it clear they were happy with our education programs. She also reported that the University's sale of bonds for some of our planned facilities were completed at a favorable interest rate.

Dean Cooney reported that Solveig Robinson of the English department has been awarded an American Council of Learned Societies grant to do research next year.

President Pierce asked Dean Cooney to continue to preside over discussion of proposed changes to the *Faculty Code*. After the most recent faculty meeting on March 24, 1998, one additional document was distributed to faculty by the Code Revision Committee (CRC). This seven-page document, dated March 26, 1998, contained three green pages of changes to Chapter III revisions originally proposed in the buff-colored document dated December 1, 1997, and four white pages restating the proposed changes to Chapters IV, V, and VI originally printed in the CRC's October 6, 1997 memo to faculty.

### **We began by continuing from the March 24, 1998 meeting consideration of proposed change #81 to Chapter III, Section 6, k and l, reproduced here from the green sheet dated March 26, 1998:**

*Retain (existing Code, Chapter III, Section 8, k): "The decision of the majority of the hearing board, and any dissent, shall be transmitted in writing to the president. That decision may include a recommendation that the matter be returned to the department and/or Advancement Committee for correction of deficiencies. The board shall send the president exhibits received in the hearing and the electronic record."*

*Split off a new section l: "The president may return the matter to the Advancement Committee and/or department for further consideration or correction of deficiencies. If not, the president shall submit the entire hearing board report together with a recommendation on the hearing board report to the Academic and Student Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees for review and recommendation to the full Board. In any case, the president shall notify the appellant whether the hearing board report has been accepted or rejected."*

The explanation for this change provided on the green sheet is: "Revision clarifies "further consideration" and provides for consistent use of "appellant" rather than "evaluee" in this section of the Code. The CRC, based on further discussion, recommends retaining the term "the matter" as used in these two paragraphs."

At the March 24, 1998 meeting there was discussion about the wisdom of retaining the words "the matter." Dean Cooney explained that, based on post-meeting discussions, the CRC had decided to recommend retaining these words, since to specify more specifically what is to be returned to the department may compromise the confidentiality of letters.

There was no discussion.

**We next considered proposed change #83, to Chapter III, Section 7,b, reproduced here from the green sheet dated March 26, 1998:**

*Substitute: "This file shall be used only in the evaluation process and shall contain only information pertinent to that process, such as (1) a statement of department, school, or program evaluation criteria and standards; (2) the evaluatee's evaluation statement and curriculum vita; (3) student course evaluations submitted as part of the evaluation process; (4) evaluation letters prepared by colleagues; (5) the department summary of deliberation and recommendation; (6) the Advancement Committee's recommendation; (7) all other written materials accumulated as a result of the formal evaluation processes specified in Chapter III of the Code; (8) if applicable, the president's recommendation to the Board of Trustees; and (9) other material clearly relevant to the faculty member's role as a professional educator which may be the result of the Professional Standards Committee's or the Dean's application of other university policies, provided that the faculty member is notified that the material is being added to the file."*

*For (existing Code, Chapter III, Section 9, b): "This file shall be used only in the evaluation process and shall contain only information pertinent to that process, such as (1) information on the faculty member's teaching; (2) information on the faculty member's research, publication, and professional activities; (3) information on the faculty member's participation in university service; (4) summaries and raw data on student course evaluations; (5) the Advancement Committee's recommendation to the president; and (6) other material clearly relevant to the faculty member's role as a professional educator, including department, school or program recommendations."*

The explanation for this change provided on the green sheet is: "Given all of the revisions to Chapter III which call for written notifications, responses, etc., CRC believes it is important to state that these materials will be included in the faculty member's evaluation file."

Suzanne Barnett pointed out that the language "student course evaluations" is incorrect, since what we have are "instructor evaluations." The CRC will work on this, but even "instructor evaluations" may not be clear language, since "instructor" designates rank elsewhere in the code. President Pierce suggested using "student evaluations of faculty." Dean Cooney pointed out that the new language in (9) requires that the faculty member be notified that "other material" is being added to the file, something that the old "other material" language in (6) does not require.

**We considered proposed change #84, to Chapter III, Section 7,e:**

*Substitute: "All materials in the faculty member's evaluation file shall be open to the Advancement Committee, the dean, the president, and the Board of Trustees. The file shall be open to the faculty member involved, except when the purpose of the evaluation is to grant or deny tenure or when the faculty member has waived access to letters of evaluation as provided for in Section 4.a.1.(d), in which case confidential letters may not be read by the faculty member. Without the express consent of the faculty member, the evaluation file shall be closed to all others."*

*For (existing Code, Chapter III, Section 9, e): "All materials in the faculty member's file shall be open to the Advancement Committee, the dean, the president, and the Board of Trustees. It shall be open to the faculty member involved, except when the purpose of the evaluation is to grant or deny tenure. Such faculty shall be considered in the same manner as those who waive access to letters of evaluation as provided for in this section. Without the express consent of the faculty member, the file shall be closed to all others."*

University of Puget Sound Faculty Meeting Minutes  
April 1, 1998, Page 3

Bruce Lind noted that all trustees seem to have access to files, and argued that only those with a legitimate reason should have access. Dean Cooney pointed out that this is current code language. He pointed to other code language which specified that trustees have access to a file only if and when they are part of the formal evaluation process. He said that trustees cannot simply come in and "browse the files on a whim." However, during trustee review of a particular case, trustees probably could not be denied access.

Barnett noted that the old language on a faculty member's right to waive access to letters is gone. She said she hoped faculty would always have that right, and asked whether the new language retains the right by assumption. Kris Bartanen pointed out that the "right to waive access" language is retained in Chapter III, Section 4,a,(1),(d).

Having finished review of the CRC's proposed changes to Chapter III of the code, the faculty began consideration of proposed changes to Chapter IV. President Pierce asked Dean Cooney to continue to preside.

**We considered proposed change #85, to Chapter IV, Section 1,b:**

*Substitute: "Tenure offers protection for academic freedom and security. It must be earned through superior professional achievement. Tenure is a career-long commitment by the university to the faculty member and should be regarded by both parties with great care. The tenure decision is usually the most important decision the university makes concerning a faculty member's entire career."*

*For: "Tenure is essentially for academic freedom and security, but it must be earned through superior professional achievement. Tenure is a career-long commitment by the university to the faculty member. It should be regarded by both parties with great care. The tenure decision is usually the most important decision the university shall make concerning a faculty member's entire career."*

There was no discussion. John Riegsecker pointed out that "Tenure and Promotion of Faculty" is the new title of Chapter IV.

**We next considered proposed change #86, to Chapter IV, Section 1,c:**

*Substitute: "Tenure may be conferred only by action of the University Board of Trustees. Such action occurs upon recommendation by the president . . ."*

*For: "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 . . ."*

There was no discussion.

**We considered proposed change #87, to Chapter IV, Section 1,d:**

*Move criteria for tenure to Chapter III, Section 3, d.*

There was no discussion.

**We considered proposed change #88, to Chapter IV, Section 1,e(1):**

University of Puget Sound Faculty Meeting Minutes  
April 1, 1998, Page 4

*Add: "Faculty members may request early consideration for tenure, but no faculty member will be considered more than once."*

Bill Breitenbach said that he thought that the prohibition against coming up for tenure twice was a substantive change, not a clarification. Barnett responded that we need to bring the words in the code into line with practice, which is that you can only come up for tenure once. Breitenbach said that we can't say what the practice is if it has never come up, and that we may be removing a theoretical right. Dean Cooney said that someone denied for tenure would receive a terminal contract for the next year and would have no recourse, so that the theoretical right to two chances at tenure probably does not exist. A straw poll showed faculty 6-4 in favor of retaining the proposed language as a revision to the code. But later, in discussion of proposed change #89 (see below), the faculty agreed to strike proposed change #88 altogether.

**We considered proposed change #89, to Chapter IV, Section 1,e(2):**

*Substitute: "Leaves of absence may be exempted from computation time for tenure consideration in accordance with published university policies or by agreement between the faculty members and the dean."*

*For: "Leaves of absence are not generally included in computation time."*

Bartanen explained that "published university policies" refers to the family and medical leave policy and other policies published in such places as *University Resources for Faculty Professional Development*. Breitenbach responded that allowing leaves to be included in computation time for tenure is a substantive change, not a clarification. Dean Cooney said that actual practice has entirely abandoned the prohibition against counting leaves in tenure computation time. For example, the time of tenure consideration is not delayed for junior faculty who receive Martin Nelson sabbatical fellowships. He said the new language is *permissive*.

Lind suggested replacing the wording "If tenure is not granted by that time, the seventh year's contract shall be terminal" in Chapter IV, 1,e with "If tenure is not granted, the next year's contract shall be terminal." Dean Cooney pointed out that this wording obviates the need for proposed change #88 altogether. The consensus was that proposed revision #88 should be stricken.

Barnett pointed out that "career service" in the old Section 5 should be changed to "tenure-line service in the new Section 1,e.

With regard to the reference in proposed change #89 to "published university policies," Breitenbach expressed concern about making the code subservient to other university policies. Bartanen responded that these policies can be dealt with more easily if they are outside the code. Dean Cooney added that perhaps reference to them in the code is what makes it possible for them to exist outside the code.

Sunil Kukreja questioned the appropriateness of the conjunction "or." Dean Cooney responded that all these policies require the dean's involvement, and that changing "or" to "and" would imply incorrectly that something in addition is required.

**We next considered proposed change #90, to Chapter IV, Section 1,g:**

*Add: Dismissal of tenured faculty shall occur only under the following conditions:*

There was no discussion.

**We considered proposed change #91, to Chapter IV, Section 2, a and b:**

*Substitute:*

*a. "Promotion is advancement in rank by a tenure-line faculty member. As outlined below, tenure-line assistant professors are eligible for promotion to the rank of associate professor and tenure-line associate professors are eligible for promotion to the rank of professor."*

*b. Tenure-line faculty are considered for promotion to the next higher rank at the following points in their time of service at the University of Puget Sound.*

*(1) Assistant professors are normally considered for promotion during their sixth year in that rank at the university; and*

*(2) Associate professors are most often considered for promotion during their sixth year in that rank at the university, but the decision when to request consideration for promotion rests with the faculty member."*

*For: "Tenure-line faculty are normally considered for promotion to the next higher rank at the following points in their time of service at the University of Puget Sound.*

*a. Assistant professors, during their sixth year in that rank at the university;*

*and*

*b. Associate professors, during their sixth year in that rank at the university."*

Barnett asked if the wording in a(1) precludes assistant professors from coming up for promotion earlier than the sixth year if they come in with experience. Dean Cooney responded no. He said that no substantive change was being proposed here.

In response to the suggestion that perhaps assistant professors should be able to decide when they will come up for promotion, Dean Cooney responded that this would be a substantive change. He said that the time of promotion consideration is specified in the appointment letter. He suggested adding the following underlined words to a(1): "Assistant professor are normally considered for promotion during their sixth year in that rank at the university unless otherwise specified in their letter of appointment; and." Barnett added that it is awkward when promotion to full professor comes before tenure.

**We considered proposed change #92, to Chapter IV, Section 2,b,(4):**

*Insert: "A faculty member who wishes early promotion and believes grounds exist for it shall request it in writing to the head officer and the dean. If either the head officer or the dean agrees, the dean shall then initiate the evaluation proceedings."*

Breitenbach said that he thought this was without question a substantive change. He said current language allows an evaluation for promotion whenever the faculty member requests it, regardless of the wishes of the dean or department head. The consensus was that, even though someone might be looney tunes to insist on a promotion evaluation against the wishes of the dean or department head, Breitenbach was correct, and that change #92 should be stricken and added to a list of substantive changes to be considered later.

**We considered proposed change #93, to Chapter IV, Section 2,b,(5):**

*Add: "At least one year shall pass between completion of a normally scheduled evaluation and a request for a new evaluation."*

University of Puget Sound Faculty Meeting Minutes  
April 1, 1998, Page 6

Dean Cooney said that this addition grows out of practice in which the Faculty Advancement Committee could not do another evaluation immediately because not enough time had passed for there to be anything new to consider. Bartanen pointed out that we have already discussed this issue in discussion of proposed revisions to Chapter III. Dean Cooney suggested that the CRC check the reason for repeating the language in Chapter IV and report back.

**Finally, we considered proposed change #94, to Chapter IV, Section 2,c:**

There was no discussion.

We adjourned at 5:24 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John M. Finney  
Secretary of the Faculty