

DRAFT:
MINUTES OF THE PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS COMMITTEE

9/26/08

Present: Bartanen, Bodine, Goldstein, Haltom, Tomlin, Woods

The meeting was convened at 11:00 AM

Bartanen announced that the revised guidelines for administering in-class student evaluations of faculty were circulated.

The minutes of 9/19/08 were approved as circulated.

The majority of the meeting was devoted to assigning sub-committee tasks. Using the lettered designation on today's agenda, the following charges were assigned (subject to approval by the absent members Christoph and Edgoose):

<u>Faculty Member</u>	Charge (Agenda Item)
Bodine	Science, Technology & Society Faculty evaluation guidelines (A), Faculty recruitment guidelines (H), Dual {shared} career policy (I)
Christoph	Research Misconduct Policy (F), Violence Prevention Policy (G), Dual {shared} career policy (I)
Edgoose	Definition of tenure-line faculty member (C), Dual Department Appointment/Evaluation Criteria (E), Status of colleague letters in a closed file (J)
Goldstein	School of Music faculty evaluation guidelines (B), Informal and formal challenges to evaluation (D), Dual Department Appointment/Evaluation Criteria (E), Research Misconduct Policy (F)
Haltom	Science, Technology & Society Faculty evaluation guidelines (A), Informal and formal challenges to evaluation (D), Faculty recruitment guidelines (H), Status of colleague letters in a closed file (J)
Woods	School of Music faculty evaluation guidelines (B), Definition of tenure-line faculty member (C), Violence Prevention Policy (G)

There was also some discussion about the possible inclusion of an additional item: Should the PSC attempt to unify the "Professional Growth" segments of the individual

departmental evaluation guideline documents? A brief discussion occurred on this point (see a follow up discussion outlined in the Oct. 3 minutes).

In addition, some discussion focused on addressing Item #7 in the "matrix", concerning Sexual Harassment (sic); of particular concern was whether the category should be relabeled to better reflect the true range and nature of the issues of concern that arise on student evaluations of faculty (perhaps renamed simply "Harassment" or "Hostile Environment", for example). This will also be placed on hold until the PSC can develop a clearer and more fully developed picture about this issue.

The Chair will distribute any appropriate documents to each faculty member in preparation for subcommittee meetings; subcommittee members should also become aware of the notations on the matrix, particularly with respect to due dates for actions (NOTE: the Oct. 8 deadline for the charge: Status of colleague letters in a closed file (Item J) is not a hard deadline).

(NOTE: The PSC subcommittee WILL make a good faith effort to create a status report within 2 weeks for STS faculty evaluation guidelines (Item A: Science), in order to give sufficient lead time before the 10/24/08 deadline for a 3-year faculty evaluation file this year. Dean Bartanen noted that if the subcommittee cannot accomplish this, she will postpone the due date for that file by a reasonable amount of time to allow for the evaluatee to properly prepare the file).

The Chair will circulate Professor Share's document entitled: "What to Look for in Departmental Evaluation Guidelines, Professional Standards Committee, Origin 2006", in order to help the various subcommittees assigned with the task of reviewing departmental guidelines this year (STS and Music).

The final item of discussion for the day was that of the dual role (and thus raising the possibility of a potential conflict of interest) of the PSC as both "informal consultant" to the Dean on Code matters, and as adjudicator in some manner on the very issue that the PSC had previously acted as "consultant". The issue focuses on the real need for the Dean to be able to use the PSC for consultation with some assured degree of confidentiality, while meeting the parallel and simultaneous requirement for the PSC to maintain full transparency and openness in its proceedings, particularly in the official Minutes that are circulated to the faculty. Of particular concern is that the PSC, in acting as "informal consultant" to the Dean, might actually have some role in creating a situation that it must later take an active role in adjudicating. Issues raised included standards of confidentiality in PSC minutes, emails, and communications.

One approach that may help to address this would be to pose to the PSC one or more hypothetical situations where such a conflict of interest could arise at the beginning of each academic year, as a training exercise for both old and new PSC members. The possibility of developing such a training workshop will be explored later this year (this item will be added to the "matrix" list of to do items).

The meeting was adjourned at 11:59 AM.

Respectfully submitted,

Barry Goldstein