Minutes of the Professional Standards Committee
March 2, 2006
Present: Kris Bartanen, Bill Breitenbach, Karl Fields, Grace Kirchner, Sarah Moore, John Riegsecker, Don Share, Carolyn Weisz (chair). Also attending part of the meeting were guests Terry Beck, Jim McCullough, and Nila Wiese

PSC Chair Weisz called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m.
The minutes of February 23, 2006 were approved as written.
We reviewed the status of several departmental standards documents. The School of Business has submitted a clean copy of theirs to the Dean's office, but we are not sure if that version incorporates the changes we have recommended. Environmental Studies has been notified that approval of their document is still pending; they are aware of its importance given upcoming evaluations. We will review revisions proposed by Theater Arts to their evaluation standards at our next meeting.

Discussion turned to the best procedure for moving through our proposed amendment to Ch. III, Sections 6 and 7 at the next faculty meeting. Weisz distributed a handout that shows alternatives to various portions of the amendment as it is now written. This handout will be used to guide the process. We decided that the best sequence would be: (1) Faculty present be polled as to several options regarding the confidentiality of hearings and asked to identity all of those that they find acceptable. The winner of that poll, i.e., the one found acceptable by the greatest number, will then be pitted against the language that is currently in the amendment in section III, 6, c., (8). (2) The alternative to section $7 \mathrm{i}-\mathrm{l}$ will be pitted against the existing language. (3) A number of minor "housekeeping" amendments will then be offered, including the "courtesy" notification of the Senate chair if probable cause is not found. (4) Finally we will ask that the faculty vote on the resulting, presumably modified, amendment. PSC members acknowledged that anyone present at the meeting could choose to offer additional changes.

Three representatives from the Diversity Committee, Terry Beck, Jim McCullough and Nila Wiese, joined us for a discussion of their proposal to add language to the "buff" document that would encourage faculty to attend to issues of diversity. In response to a question regarding the purpose of the buff document, we agree that it is intended to be more user friendly and detailed than the Faculty Code, but cannot supersede or extend the Code. In a wide ranging discussion there appeared to be general agreement as to the desirability of alerting faculty to the importance of diversity issues, but concern about appearing to create performance expectations that have not been agreed upon by the faculty as a whole. We also noted the desirability of encouraging attention to diversity content in courses, as well as attending to pedagogical issues raised by diverse students. One suggestion concerned the university-approved statement on diversity. It might be a useful reference point and be placed in the buff document as a new section together with some examples of how diversity-related activities might be evaluated with regard to the
existing standards. The Diversity Committee representatives indicated that they will probably be returning with another proposal that takes our feedback into consideration.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:57p.m.
Respectfully submitted,

Grace Kirchner

