

Minutes of the Professional Standards Meeting September 5, 2008

Present: Neshyba (convener from the Faculty Senate), Bartanen (ex-officio), Bodine, Edgoose, Goldstein, Tomlin, Christoph, Wood, Haltom.

The meeting was convened at 11 a.m.

In accordance with the faculty bylaws, Professor Neshyba, a member of the Faculty Senate, convened the committee and administered the election of committee chair. Through written ballot, nominations were collected, followed by a vote. Professor Tomlin was elected.

The minutes of May 3, 2008 were approved with the understanding that page numbers in the minutes would be adjusted to reflect the final revised Buff document.

Documents were distributed to members of the committee including:

- 1) The table of last year's ongoing work, including charges from the senate and other topics for consideration.
- 2) The revised regulation changes on institutional reporting requirements for research misconduct.
- 3) A request for review and comments from Rosa Beth Gibson and John Hickey regarding the university's violence prevention policy.
- 4) Request for feedback on revisions to a letter to all faculty regarding procedures for completion of student evaluations of faculty courses.
- 5) A copy of faculty recruitment guidelines with a note that the document needs to be reviewed to ensure that reformatting by Human Resources staff has not resulted in unapproved text changes in sections subject to PSC oversight.
- 6) New members received copies of the faculty code, Faculty bylaws, and the buff document of faculty evaluation procedures.

Dean Bartanen mentioned the following issues and topics.

- She noted that STS needs to have their evaluation guidelines reviewed early this semester because they have an upcoming third-year faculty review.
- The dual career faculty policy discussion is carried over from last year.
- A question was posed over the summer for PSC review as follows: Do colleagues in a closed file have an opportunity to read letters written by other members of the faculty.

The committee reviewed the table of charges from last year, noting the rationale for the information related to priority, how long the issue has been before the committee, and the order of submission. The committee agreed to remove completed charges from the table

and to renumber the topics in the order listed. The committee began an informal discussion of prioritization.

As part of this overall process, the committee reflected on the standing of code amendments in relation to code implementation and the process by which multiple interpretations lead to formal code revisions. We considered possible venues for further discussion of this issue including, the senate, the faculty as a whole, and the PSC. The question of code revisions and interpretation was briefly linked to broader questions about faculty evaluations, resource investment in evaluation, and institutional culture.

Dean Bartanen asked for amendments or corrections to the letter regarding procedures for student evaluations. Suggestions were made as follows: 1) to keep language consistent regarding instructors vs. faculty, and 2) to clarify that 20 minutes is required for each faculty member when team teachers are evaluated during the same class period. Because members were still editing at the end of the hour, the committee agreed to return to amendment and approval of the document at the next meeting. A question was raised for future discussion about the potential use of computers and electronic submission of evaluations in lieu of paper questionnaires.

The committee adjourned at 12:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa Fortlouis Wood