

**REVISED DRAFT**  
University of Puget Sound  
Professional Standards Committee  
March 25, 2013, 8:00, a.m., Wyatt 225

Members present: Kris Bartanen, Doug Cannon, Pat Krueger, Andreas Madlung, Doug Sackman (acting chair), Kurt Walls.

**I. Announcements**

No announcements.

**II. Approval of minutes of 3-11-13**

Minutes were approved unanimously.

**III. Business:**

**a) Criteria for the evaluation for the director of the CWLT**

It was discussed to what degree the director of the CWLT would be protected from expectations that would go beyond those other faculty members have to fulfill to achieve a positive recommendation.

It was noted that there are other positions at the university that differ from more conventional positions within a given department. These positions also are evaluated with the explicit knowledge and understanding that performance in these positions is evaluated somewhat differently from those of other members in the home department. Thus the required "same high standards" could be met in different ways in a position, such as the one held by the director of the CWLT.

It was discussed if the reduced amount of formal classroom teaching would make it more difficult for the director to show excellence in teaching, with the reminder that evidence of teaching in non-classroom contexts could be brought to bear.

It was discussed to what extend the director of the CWLT would be expected to participate in professional development, including publication, in the field of writing, learning and teaching. It was questioned if the discussed document was meant as a protection of the director if s/he chose to do research in this field (rather than in his/her previous field of expertise) or if it could be interpreted as a requirement for doing research in the field of writing, learning and teaching.

It was discussed to what level the concerns raised by the committee rise to the level of importance for sending the document back to the department for clarification. It was clarified that this committee's responsibility is to check for compatibility with the university code.

It was moved and seconded that the document be approved as is, as it appeared to align with the code. The document was approved unanimously.

**b) Evaluation of 3<sup>rd</sup> year associate professors**

There was discussion about the question whether or not evaluations of 3<sup>rd</sup> year associates should be changed. There is currently some discussion about this in the FAC as well. It was discussed if streamlining this particular review might be a way to decrease the burden of the review to all parties involved. Simply dropping this review is not possible because of accreditation guidelines.

**The meeting was adjourned at 8:42am.**

Respectfully submitted,  
Andreas Madlung