Professional Standards Committee
Minutes for 10.02.14

MacBain called the meeting to order at 8:31 am.

Members present were Kris Bartanen, Geoffrey Block, Douglas Cannon, Betsy Kirkpatrick, Tiffany MacBain (chair), Andreas Madlung, Mark Reinitz, and Amy Spivey

1. M/S/P to approve the minutes of the 09.25.14 meeting.

2. The initial topic concerned whether committee members should be identified by name in the minutes. The committee felt that general discussion comments will not be attributed by name, and consensus by the committee will be reported as such. For contentious issues or split decisions, comments will be attributed to specific committee members. In all cases, votes will remain anonymous.

3. Discussion of the charge concerning scanning of course evaluations by professional staff. Although the committee deferred action on the implementation of electronic student evaluations, we did want to create guidelines for administrative assistants to change to scanning student evaluations rather than photocopy them onto pink and yellow paper.

   Discussion centered around two kinds of issues: those about revision of language and directives contained in the "PSC Evaluation Memo 2013-2014" to incorporate scanning rather than photocopying of the student evaluations and those about revision of language and ideas contained in the "buff document."

   Revision of the PSC Evaluation Memo2013-2014 to guide the creation of scanned student evaluations. Suggestions:
   - Add language that requires shredding after transcription of the handwritten originals of evaluations that are requested to be typed.

   Revision of the "Buff" document to guide the use of scanned student evaluations in faculty evaluations. Discussion points:
   - There are more security issues with scanned student evaluations because these files are more easily distributed and could be preserved indefinitely.
   - Perhaps it can be set so that student evaluation files can be viewed but not downloaded. However, Tech Services indicates that while files can be set to not download, function may depend on the browser used and, on a Windows machine, the non-download setting can be circumvented with a right click.
   - Some members suggested that a security breach would affect only the evaluee because the student information is unidentified. However, others felt that handwritten evaluations might still be recognizable.
   - Other committee members commented that we already have lots of sensitive information on our laptops.

   Suggestions to enhance security:
   - After the evaluation is complete, all electronic files must be deleted from personal computers.
   - Once the files are sent to the dean's office, the files could be stored only on CDs.

4. Discussion of exactly what is included in the charges regarding departmental evaluation guidelines.

    Are we charged to check all the departmental evaluation guidelines to see if they're in compliance with the code or can we expect departments to implement changes if we've sent the information about necessary components for compliance? Do all the departments that employ course assistants now have guidelines for them?   The committee recalled having requested materials of departments last year and setting guidelines for employing course assistants. Because the PSC has acted so recently on this issue, the committee decided that Kris would email chairs to remind them that department guidelines should be updated and brought into compliance with current guidelines regarding participation by temporary faculty.

M/S/P to adjourn the meeting at 9:22.

Respectfully submitted,
Betsy Kirkpatrick, Secretary of the Day.