

Professional Standards Committee Minutes – March 6, 2017

Present: Jennifer Neighbors (chair), Garrett Milam, Amanda Mifflin, Matt Warning, Kris Bartanen, Fred Hamel, Denise Depres and Amy Odegard.

1. The committee approved minutes from the 02/20/2017 meeting.
2. There was an update on the status of the new policy on faculty sexual misconduct. The proposed new interpretations of the code are currently being reviewed by legal. If approved by legal, PSC will then conduct a final review, approve, and present to the Faculty Senate.
3. Jennifer Neighbors met with Robin Jacobson and Seth Weinberger to discuss the PSC's role in the Freedom Education Project Puget Sound (FEPPS) B.A. degree program (not yet in effect). It was discussed that it is likely that the PSC's only role in this program would be to evaluate faculty. However, this would differ from the standard evaluation process since the program includes both Puget Sound faculty and non-faculty members. It was suggested that the FEPPS organizers could look into the evaluation procedures for study abroad programs, such as Pacific Rim, which also have a mix of Puget Sound faculty and non-faculty members.
4. The committee continued discussion of evaluation options for team-taught courses. A draft team-teaching evaluation addendum (created by Fred Hamel and Suzanne Holland) was presented to the committee. This addendum form would be given to students in addition to the current standard evaluation form. The committee discussed which specific questions should be included on the addendum and the specific wording of the questions.

As an alternative to an addendum, it was also proposed that there could be two types of evaluation options, the standard evaluation form with an addendum or an alternative team-teaching evaluation form, and faculty could choose which option they would like to use. One of the draft team-teaching evaluation forms presented at a previous PSC meeting could serve as a template for the alternative evaluation form. One drawback of not using the standard evaluation form would be that there may not be consistent evaluation information if the faculty member is under review. However, it was noted that some variation in evaluation forms already exist (for example, physical/occupational therapy evaluation forms have slightly modified questions). Some committee members thought it would have a minimal impact if a faculty member did choose to use the alternative team-teaching evaluation form while under review since there are many other parts of the review file that may be used to evaluate teaching.

The committee decided to move forward with both of the two options described above: 1) the addendum and the standard evaluation form or 2) the alternative team-teaching evaluation form. Fred Hamel agreed to work on improving the language of both options. For the addendum option, it was also discussed whether the addendum should go before or after the standard evaluation form. It was agreed that it would make sense to have the addendum after the standard evaluation to avoid duplicating instructions, which would also leave more space on the addendum for evaluation questions.

Minutes taken by Amy Odegard