

## **Minutes of the Professional Standards Committee**

February 8, 2008

PRESENT: Kris Bartanen, Sigrun Bodine, Julie Nelson Christoph, Julian Edgoose, Karl Fields, Barry Goldstein, Don Share, George Tomlin

Tomlin convened the meeting at 1:02 p.m.

### **1. Minutes from February 1<sup>st</sup> Meeting**

Copies of proposed revisions of one portion of the minutes were circulated and discussed. Minutes were approved with these revisions.

### **2. Charge 18: Nature and Procedure for Drawing Up Letters of Appointment for Interdisciplinary and Multi-departmental Faculty Positions**

After a brief review of last week's conclusions and further discussion, the matter was referred to a subcommittee for drafting of appropriate *Code* language.

### **3. Charge 20: Head Officer's Summary of Internal and External Letters**

Tomlin initiated the discussion, speaking from a 7 October 2007 e-mail from Share to the PSC in which Share observed that the *Code* does not seem to require a separate summary of internal and external letters. Share's message noted, however, that it might be useful for the recipient to have two separate letters or at least a clearly delineated distinction between the summaries of departmental and non-departmental letters.

A review of relevant sections of the *Code* (Chapter III, Section 4, b.—pp. 13-14— and the Unified Interpretation of Chapter III, Sections 4—pp. 44-45) led the committee to conclude that the *Code* is silent on this matter and does not appear to call for a separation of these letters, calling simply for “a summary of letters.”

In the discussion that ensued, the following points were made:

- If all letters are summarized together, then the summary might be misleading to the recipient
- If there is only one outside letter, separate summaries would jeopardize the confidentiality of the letter writer
- Most head officer summaries are broad summaries of all letters rather than serial or letter-by-letter summaries
- If this is not a significant issue in most cases, then perhaps it could be left to the discretion of the head officer or friendly advice could be offered to the head officer in the buff document

Committee members wondered how this issue had come up originally. It was determined that Bartanen should return to the FAC to get the Advancement Committee's sense of how significant this issue is.

### **4. Charge 15: Streamlined Evaluations for Ongoing Instructors**

Among the “End of the Year” issues carried over for the PSC to address was the question of whether or not it would be appropriate to allow ongoing (long-term) instructors, who are reviewed every three years, to avail themselves of the streamlined review process that is now available only to tenure line associate and full professors. In the discussion that ensued, it was asked why these instructors were

excluded in the first place, whether or not it would require an amendment to the *Code* to include instructors in the streamlined process, whether or not it made sense to adjust the calendar to have streamlined reviews due in the spring instead of the fall, and whether or not it made sense to shift these evaluations from every three years to every five years.

Bartanen was asked to gather additional information regarding the number and length of service of ongoing instructors.\* It was proposed that once the PSC had the opportunity to review that additional information, that Edgoose and Christoph draft a *Code* amendment for Chapter III, Section 5.a. (p. 17) to add ongoing instructors.

\*Subsequent to the meeting, Bartanen reported in an e-mail message the following information to the PSC regarding the length of service of ongoing instructors:

- 15-20 years of service: 6 instructors
- 21-25 years of service: 8 instructors
- 26-29 years of service: 6 instructors
- Total ongoing instructors: 20

**5. Charge 21: Departmental Query Regarding Sexually Harrassing Comments on Student Evaluations**

In the waning moments of the meeting, PSC colleagues began to discuss an issue raised by a head officer of a department concerned that at least several junior faculty women have received inappropriately personal and indeed sexually harassing comments on student evaluations. Tomlin affirmed that this is an important matter and colleagues agreed that the PSC will need to give it serious consideration

The meeting was adjourned at 2:00pm?

Submitted Respectfully,

Karl Fields