

Minutes: Professional Standards Committee
Wyatt 326
Thursday, March 13, 2014

PRESENT: Geoffrey Block (Acting Chair), Doug Cannon, Bill Barry, Mark Reinitz, Kurt Walls, Kristine Bartanen, Tiffany MacBain

The meeting convened at 4:02pm.

- I. The committee approved the minutes of Feb 27, 2014.
- II. The committee continued to consider ways to streamline the faculty evaluation process.
 - a. Review, discussion, and revision of Kurt Walls's proposal to recommend the following changes:
 - i. 3rd-year associate review to follow model of 1st- and 2nd-year assistant. Parties involved in evaluation: evaluatee, head officer, and dean.
 - ii. Following promotion to full, faculty reviews will occur every five years and be streamlined. Parties involved in evaluation: evaluatee, head officer, the dean, or a designated member of the FAC. This recommendation reflects the PSC's sense that the review process has become unduly cumbersome and need not (unless requested) involve the whole department beyond promotion to full; yet faculty value FAC letters of review, in part because the FAC letter sets the evaluation in a context larger than that set by a chair, who is also a colleague. Therefore, FAC involvement ought to be preserved.
 - b. The committee discussed the timing of applying for promotion to full. The current timeframe allows for streamlined review every 3rd year after a faculty member is promoted to associate, and full review (evaluatee, department, chair, dean, FAC) when a faculty member seeks promotion to full professor. The revised timeframe maintains the 3-year cycle but simplifies the first 3rd-year associate review (see II.a.i above). Many faculty members apply for promotion to full professor three years after the 3rd-year associate review. Others opt to defer. The committee reaffirmed the structure that will support the candidate for full professor calling for a full review the third year after promotion to associate, or at any time the candidate wishes to apply for full professor status (in accord with the requirements of Chapter III, section 2 of the Faculty Code).
 - c. Committee members discussed whether or not the recommended changes would discourage colleagues from visiting classes.
 - d. Committee members affirmed that the proposed changes would not compromise the accreditation committee's sense of the rigor of Puget Sound's process of evaluation.

- III. Action: The committee determined that we would take the recommendations to the Faculty Senate for endorsement and draft language. The Senate's language would then be presented to the full faculty.
- IV. The committee returned to discussion of the Buff Document and determined that the next publication of that document could contain the PSC's guidance for length and content of review letters. To meet the publication deadline, the PSC must decide upon these recommendations by the end of this semester. In preparation, committee members agreed to review pages 8,9, and 17 of the current Buff Document.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Tiffany MacBain