

Professional Standards Committee Meeting Minutes for February 5, 2018

Members present: Amanda Mifflin (chair), Jennifer Neighbors, Suzanne Holland, Fred Hamel, David Andreson, Andreas Madlung, Kris Bartanen; *Absent:* Denise Despres

Minutes from the January 22 meeting of the PSC were approved. A motion was passed to allow the approval of minutes over email.

The committee revisited the discussion from January 22, asking for clarification from Dean Bartanen on the role of the interim Dean of the Faculty and on language in the Faculty Bylaws which speak to the ex-officio membership of the Dean of the University on the Faculty Advancement Committee (Faculty Bylaws p.8, Article 5, Section 6, Part C, Letter A). Dean Bartanen gave background on communications with university faculty about the role of the Interim Dean of the Faculty for 2017-2018. Discussion revolved around the practice of assigning a designee to serve in the Dean of the University's ex-officio role, particularly with the FAC, and whether by-law language should be amended.

The committee discussed a Faculty Senate proposal (see Appendix) to revise the language of the Faculty Code regarding promotion to full professor. The committee discussed the proposed language and offered suggestions for the Senate as they continue deliberations.

A brief update was provided by the chair on communications across campus with respect to the committee's work on bias in student evaluations. The university's Title IX officer as well as representatives from the Committee on Diversity will be invited to a future PSC meeting. One member gave an update on communications with library liaison, Andrea Kueter, and shared an article titled "The Bias in Student Course Evaluations," which emphasizes what instructors can do to mitigate evaluation bias. The committee discussed bringing the larger issue, in conjunction with the Faculty Senate, to the scheduled April 4 faculty meeting – and whether a second meeting in April might be also called.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00pm.

Minutes by Fred Hamel

APPENDIX

Request from the Faculty Senate:

The Faculty Senate has spent more than a year collecting information and developing recommendations to revise the Faculty Code with regard to the language around promotion to full professor. A committee of members of the Faculty Senate, convened by the Faculty Senate to do this work, believes it would be best to present two options to the faculty:

- a simple revision of the existing language that would clarify any ambiguity
- a more expansive revision of the language that would alter our expectations about promotion to full

Below, please find our draft language of the second of these. We are sending this to the PSC on the understanding that the PSC can offer valuable insights into the compatibility of this language with the Faculty Code (and whether other portions of the Code or elements of the review process would have to be altered as well).

PROPOSED REVISION to the Faculty Code (at III.3.e):

“Faculty promotion shall be based upon the quality of a person's performance of academic duties. Specifically, decisions whether to promote shall be based upon the quality of the faculty member's performance in the following areas, listed in order of importance:

- (1) teaching and related responsibilities, including the mentoring of students;
- (2) professional growth;
- (3) participation in service to the university, to one's profession, or—in ways related to one's professional interests and expertise—to the larger community.

Because the university seeks the highest standards for faculty advancement, mere satisfactory performance is no guarantee of promotion. In addition, appointment in the rank of associate professor and professor normally requires a doctoral, or other equivalent terminal degree. Within the category of professional growth, candidates for promotion to the rank of full professor must demonstrate significant scholarly achievement. Within the category of service, candidates for promotion to the rank of full professor must provide evidence of a significant contribution to the university. In no case is promotion to be recommended without a determination that the candidate has maintained a consistent high quality of teaching and a sustained record of service.”