

Professional Standards Committee  
Minutes for 9-20-95

Present: Rousslang, Riegsecker, L. Wood, Taranovski, Potts, Goldstein, Breitenbach, and Block

1. Election by paper ballot for chair of the committee was conducted with Lisa Wood selected as chair.
2. The committee reviewed the Bill Beardsley's memo to the Faculty Senate summarizing suggested charges for the coming year. These include:
  - a. Examination of departmental standards and criteria for tenure and advancement, with particular attention to their consistency with the Faculty Code.
  - b. Clarification of the role of instructors across the university with regard to substance and clarity in the code itself.
  - c. Retirement policies as listed in the code and issues related to normal and early retirement.
  - d. Review of department statements and criteria, as necessary.

The faculty senate has not formally charged the Professional Standards committee as of this meeting.

3. It was agreed that the committee would meet on consecutive Wednesdays at 3 p.m. in the Shelmidine room, We may move to a bi-weekly schedule should that be deemed adequate for completion of our work.
4. We discussed the methods and practices related to official closure of committee meetings. It was suggested that meetings be considered open unless officially voted closed by the committee, as per the Faculty Code. A question of status could be raised in advance of the meeting or subsequent to the arrival of a guest. Personnel issues and grievances might give rise to a designation of closure. No specific guidelines were outlined.
5. The committee discussed the most efficient methods of accomplishing its work this year. It was suggested that we use subcommittee structures to address the topics of retirement and instructor status. The plenary sessions would be devoted to issues of evaluation and standards of professional growth. Each member agreed to review documents from last year and make proposals regarding the best methods for addressing these issues. Suggested topics include:
  - a. Standards of Professional Growth--moving target?  
How shall standards be set? Should they be equivalent across departments and subdisciplines?
  - b. Procedures for Evaluation--Should all departments use the same procedures? How should evaluation be structured? What is the best method for communicating evaluation procedures?
  - c. Departmental Procedures and Code Procedures--How are the documents from the departments related to the code and documents from Professional Standards?
  - d. Consistency within the Code-- Are the standards consistent across levels of academic hierarchy? Is the language consistent in each section of the code that discusses professional growth in particular? If the code were clearer and more consistent there might be a lesser need for non-documented practices which are likely to come under fire during grievances and disputes (and which tend to instigate such problems).

Meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa F. Wood

Next Meeting: Wednesday, September 27th @ 3 p.m., Shelmidine Room