

University of Puget Sound
Professional Standards Committee
October 4th, 2012, 8:30 AM, Wyatt 225

Members present: Kris Bartanen, Doug Cannon, Pat Krueger, Andreas Madlung, Doug Sackman, Kurt Walls, Jennifer Hastings, and Seth Weinberger

The meeting was called to order at 8:30 AM by Seth Weinberger.

I. Approval of minutes of 9-26-12

Minutes were approved unanimously.

II. New charges from the Faculty Senate were presented to the committee.

These charges are:

1. Clarify (a) expectation for junior (tenure-line) faculty participation in evaluations of departmental colleagues, and (b) if a written recommendation is required of junior faculty in a change of status review (promotion, tenure);
2. Clarify who is responsible for ensuring adequate classroom visits by colleagues, the head officer or the evaluatee; and
3. Clarify whether a letter of evaluation sent directly to the Dean/Faculty Advancement Committee in an open file may be read by an evaluatee.

III. The committee started the discussion with the clarification of whether a letter of evaluation sent directly to the Dean/Faculty Advancement Committee in an open file may be read by an evaluatee.

It was clarified by the committee that these are letters sent to the dean *instead of* the department head. It was discussed that such letter could be a second letter a department colleague might write in addition to his/her letter to the department head where the only difference would be whether the department colleagues would see such letter. The question was raised if the letter writer would know that the file was open. It was mentioned that the writer could ask the chairperson of the department but if a writer from off campus was under the impression that his/her letter was confidential, yet the status of the file was unknown to the writer, such circumstance could cause a conflict.

Page 20, paragraph 2 was proposed to be amended to read “The head officer notifies departmental colleagues, and outside letter writers upon receipt of their letter, as to whether the evaluation file is open or closed”. There was agreement on the committee to make the change.

IV. The second charge by the Faculty Senate was discussed: “Clarify who is responsible for ensuring adequate classroom visits by colleagues, the head officer or the evaluatee.”

The buff document on p11, paragraph 2 states that the “final determination of adequacy rests with the head officer and the Faculty Advancement Committee”.

Kris Bartanen told the committee that the FAC currently sends the information about upcoming evaluations and visitation requirements to the department heads the year prior to an evaluation, in hopes of increasing the visitations and spreading them over a longer period of time.

It was discussed what the advantages and disadvantages were for making the visitation requirements more specific. Many recommendations about what PSC considers “adequate” are already in the buff document on p 11 and it was felt that those recommendations were specific enough. The general agreement on the committee was that it is the head officer together with the evaluators (i.e. department faculty colleagues) who should ensure adequate visits, but not the evaluatee. It is the evaluatee’s responsibility to facilitate visitations but not to ensure that colleagues follow through conducting these visits. The committee discussed adding this language to the buff document but no specific wording recommendation was decided on.

V. The meeting adjourned at 9:30 AM.

Respectfully submitted,

Andreas Madlung