

## Professional Standards Committee (PSC) 2018-2019 Year-End Report

Committee Members: David Andresen, Kris Bartanen, Fred Hamel, Andreas Madlung (Chair), Amanda Mifflin, Pepa Lago-Grana, Jim Jasinski, Paula Wilson

This report is divided into four parts: 1) work completed by the PSC in response to official charges by the Faculty Senate; 2) work on standing charges, 3) additional work in response to requests from departments and individuals, and 4) ideas for future charges.

### **PART 1: CURRENT SENATE CHARGES**

#### **Standing Charges:**

“Faculty Bylaws, Section 6.E.c. The duties of the Committee shall be:

1. To recommend and improve continually the instruments and methods of Faculty evaluation and to facilitate their use in the University community. In performing this duty the Committee shall have the authority to call upon any part of the University for assistance.
2. To fulfill responsibilities assigned by the Faculty Code.
3. To recommend to the Faculty any changes in the Code and Bylaws when needed.
4. To establish standards of professional performance, including those for promotion and tenure, and responsibilities for members of the instructional staff.
5. Such other duties as may be assigned to it.” Source: Faculty Bylaws 2018/2019: Revised July 2018.

#### **Additional Charges from the Faculty Senate:**

1. Address the following two items carried over from last year’s year-end report:

A)

“The PSC was asked to consider the language on page 27 of the Faculty Evaluation Procedures and Criteria document that addresses the **streamlined instructor review** process. The request from the faculty member is summarized below:

The relevant line is, “Instructors who have served 17 years or more in that rank may establish an alternating schedule of full and alternative reviews in consultation with the head officer and the Dean under the procedures described in this section.” Since tenure-line professors typically go up for a full review at year 11 (about a decade), the faculty member wonders if after instructors pass that timeline (10 years of service), they could then be eligible for alternating reviews. Since instructors are up for review every three years, (compared to 5 for professors), there is already a significant check about their teaching. Perhaps after a decade the instructor review could be every 5 years, instead of every three. The faculty member feels that the current cycle of review seems like a lot to ask of long term clinical faculty.”

#### **In this matter the PSC recommends the following:**

Clinical instructors in Graduate Programs who have served 12 years or more in that rank may establish a five-year alternating schedule of full and streamlined reviews in consultation with the head officer and the Dean under the procedures described in ... [the Code].

B) Review and clarify the evaluation process for non-tenure-line positions, including visiting faculty members that stay beyond 3 years.

In this matter the PSC recommends the following:

The committee reviewed proposed changes to the Faculty Evaluation Procedures and Criteria document section entitled Evaluation of Visiting Faculty developed at the Oct 1, 2018 meeting and discussed via subsequent email. The committee unanimously approved the following proposed language:

#### Evaluation of Visiting Faculty

For those visiting faculty members whose appointments are renewable and continue beyond the second year, evaluations normally occur at the end of the first and second year and are performed by the head officer of the department, school, or program. In each year, a copy of the report is sent to the individual evaluated and to the Dean. At the end of the first year, this document is for informational purposes and no further action is required; however, the Professional Standards Committee urges evaluatees to initiate interaction with the head officer and/or colleagues for constructive utilization of this evaluation process. At the end of the second year, this evaluation may serve as a basis for renewal of contract, when applicable.

If the appointment is renewed beyond the second year, an evaluation will be conducted by the head officer at the end of year 3 and every three years thereafter, with a copy of the report sent to the individual and to the Dean. At the time of the sixth-year review, a full departmental review will be completed. Instructor and Course evaluation forms from the two semesters preceding the review years will be included in the evaluation file.

In all reviews of visiting faculty members, the evaluation criteria and procedures of the department or program will serve as the basis for review.

Chapter II, Section 5 of the *Faculty Code* authorizes the university to determine not to reappoint faculty without tenure for any reason not forbidden by the *Code*.

## **PART 2: STANDING CHARGES**

### **Review Cycle for departmental evaluation guidelines (EG)**

1. English Department: A change in the department's EGs was approved on 9/24/18.
2. Hispanic Studies Department: A revised version of the department's EGs was approved on 2/1/19.
3. Asian Studies Department: A revised version of the department's EGs was approved on 2/1/19.
4. History Department: A revised version of the department's EGs was approved on 3/29/19.
5. EGs for departments of Psychology, Geology, and Classics were evaluated and revisions requested from the departments.

### **PART 3: ADDITIONAL WORK**

1. The PSC responded to Sue Hannaford's request for the PSC to review the document drafted by LMIS called *Standards and Best Practices for Handling Sensitive and Confidential Documents* and to respond to four specific questions. This response was delivered to Dr. Hannaford via email on November 19<sup>th</sup>, 2018.
2. The committee discussed an issue that committee chair Madlung raised with Assistant Dean of Students Sarah Shives after a recent Posse retreat. Many students of color raised the question of how to report microaggressions on campus that fall short of issues that would be reported to the Bias-Hate Education Response Team (BHERT). Assistant Dean Shives suggested that chair Madlung bring the matter to PSC to, in part, determine if PSC is an appropriate (or the appropriate) forum in which to consider these concerns. After discussion, the committee reached a consensus on four points.
  - A. The concerns raised by the students are important and require the institution's attention.
  - B. Given its mission, the PSC does not believe it is an appropriate forum for addressing these concerns.
  - C. As faculty (and not necessarily speaking as the PSC), committee members suggested that advisors receive better training as to existing resources to which students might turn (office of the Associate Deans, Dean of Students office, Dean of Diversity and Inclusion office).
  - D. Again as faculty (and not necessarily speaking as the PSC), committee members suggested that any policy response should be orchestrated by the office of the Associate Deans, Dean of Students, and Dean of Diversity and Inclusion in consultation with faculty.
  - E. Provost Bartanen contributed that an updated "Referral Guide for Student Concerns" will be made available in 2019-20, which will both address the issue at heart in this discussion and will be made more visible on the Puget Sound website.

### **PART 4: FUTURE CHARGES**

The work that the PSC hopes to address in the 2019-20 academic year includes:

- Review of departmental evaluation criteria according to the published review cycle. Evaluation standards from Psychology, German Studies, and Geology, Sociology and Anthropology, Religious Studies, and Exercise Science remain outstanding or are in various stages of revisions from previous review cycles.
- Consider potential recommendations of the Student Evaluations of Teaching (SET) Committee?
- Consider recommendations forwarded by the Faculty Advancement Committee in its 2018 and 2019 year-end reports.

Submitted on behalf of the PSC,

Andreas Madlung, Chair