

DRAFT: MINUTES OF THE PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS COMMITTEE 9/14/07

Present: Bartanen, Bodine, Christoph, Edgoose, Fields, Goldstein, Share, Tomlin

Call to Order at 11:02 AM

Review of 9/07/07 Minutes; Approved with typographic error amended (see circulated minutes)

The main task of the day was then addressed, which was to set the order of business for the PSC for the year. The document "Faculty Senate Charges to the PSC, 10 September 2007" was circulated (inserted and amended *in italics* at the end of these minutes), and was used as the basis for discussion for the rest of the meeting. Our approach was to clarify the timing and origin of all 19 points in the document (thus, it was amended to read, parenthetically at the end of #9 (Dean's Letter, 9/05/06), and at the end of #16 (Dean's Letter 4/07/07), and then to prioritize the items based on our best understanding of either ease of addressing an issue, or of the timeframe required by various pending or upcoming issues.

For easy reference, the discussion below will be ordered in the sequence that items appear on the Senate Charges document, and not in the order that they were discussed during the meeting. Also, to clarify: the Senate formally charged the PSC with items #1-#15; #16 was a "carryover" from last year's PSC business, and #17-19 are issues that have been brought to the PSC from one source or another, but have not been formally included in charges by the Senate.

#1: To be addressed as needed throughout the academic year..

#2: This item has already been discussed and addressed by the PSC; needs to be added to the Faculty Code as an "Interpretation".

#3: Same as #2.

#4: Not discussed (?)

#5, 6, 7 8, 9: These are low priority, and need not be addressed until other, more pressing items are dealt with. NOTE: Forthcoming documentation that will aid in the discussion of items relating to #15 (common issues with FAC) will also help in the discussion of item #6 (carryover from last year of consideration of items in the so-called "Buff Document"- Faculty Evaluation Criteria & Procedures).

#10: Should be "bundled" (handled simultaneously) with #18, by mid-October 2007.

#11: Not discussed (?)

#12, 13, 14: To be addressed during Fall, 2007.

#15: This is pending: a discussion with the FAC to cover issues of common concern and interest will commence when some documentation that will aid the discussions is distributed.

#16: To be addressed by mid-December, 2007.

#17: This was the subject of considerable discussion during today's meeting. Much of the issue seems to hang on the actual definition of "tenure-line faculty" (refer to the Code, Chap. 1, Part B, Sections 1-3). For example, is the "tenure-line" defined by the position in the University, or the person occupying that position? Would retirement from a tenure-line confer the same status (in this case being considered, specifically how an evaluation letter would be viewed) as someone who left the University as a result of denial of tenure? One approach that was suggested was to identify a tenure-line faculty member simply as anyone who was able to vote at faculty meetings; another perspective that was offered was that emeriti faculty are no longer members of any specific department, but do have a relationship with the University as a whole, and thus should send evaluation letters directly to the Academic V.P. Reference was also made to the "Buff Document" (Faculty Evaluation Criteria & Procedures 2007-2008), page 8, #3, which indicates that any faculty member may send a letter directly to the Academic V.P. (after The Code, Chapter III, Section 4a (1c).

Further discussion was pursued, with the goal of attempting to arrive at acceptable, unique definitions of emeritus, adjunct, and part-time faculty that would clarify the distinctions among that group for the purposes of this specific issue. This discussion also included an exploration of any potential negative implications of permitting emeriti to send letters directly to the Academic V.P.; the point was raised that the guiding principle behind the Code as it exists is to protect present faculty members during the evaluation process, and thus the option of writing directly to the Academic V.P. (bypassing the home department of the evaluatee) is not really necessary for emeriti.

Thus, and Informal Interpretation was arrived at by the PSC to the effect that evaluation letters from emeritus faculty members will be sent to the department of the evaluatee (also refer to The Code, 2007, bottom of Page 44 line 45).

#18: To be addressed by mid-October, 2007.

#19: Not discussed(?).

Meeting adjourned 12:10 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,  
Barry Goldstein

Faculty Senate Charges to the PSC  
10 September 2007

Routine duties

1. Department Faculty Evaluation Criteria and Course Assistant Guidelines; requested Faculty Code interpretations; grievances, appeals, Hearing Boards, suspensions, dismissals, academic conflicts of interest; recommend to faculty changes to Code and Bylaws

Specific Faculty Code Revisions

2. Correct typos and inaccurate internal Code citations (phantom reference in Chapter 4, Section 1, f on line 46, page 23) to “Section 5”; compose Code amendment to replace “days” with “working days.” (Fac Sen AY0607 charge)

3. Revise formal Code interpretations to include “partners” in places where “spouses” are mentioned. (Fac Sen AY0607 charge)

4. (?) Revise formal Code interpretation of Chapter III, Section 6, in the old Code (“Whether a five-year evaluation of a full professor entails ‘altering the status of the evaluated faculty member’s appointment’ so as to be subject to appeals procedures”) to update internal Code citations. This formal interpretation was approved in 1997, but was inadvertently omitted from the appendix of formal Code interpretations and consequently was not revised last year along with the other formal interpretations. (Fac Sen AY0607 charge) [status needs review]

5. Examine the evaluation process for three-year visiting faculty members, which is not currently addressed in the Code. (Fac Sen AY0607 charge)

6. Revise University Evaluation Standards (buff document) to correct errors. (Fac Sen AY0607 charge) [partly done AY0607]

7. Clarify the definition of “tenure-line faculty” by Code amendment or formal interpretation. (Fac Sen AY0607 charge)

8. Examine Chapter III, Section 4.b.(4), with reference to the relationship between the informal and the formal challenges that an evaluee may make to an evaluation conducted by a department, school, or program. (Fac Sen AY0607 charge)

9. Examine Chapter III, Section 5, to consider questions that have arisen about the so-called streamlined five-year evaluations of full professors (for example, questions about classroom visitation and about the participation of departmental colleagues in these evaluations). (Fac Sen AY0607 charge) (*Dean's Letter, 9/05/06*)

### Faculty Evaluation, Special Situations

10. Examine how departments, schools, and programs in their statements of evaluation guidelines handle the assessment of an evaluatee's teaching in non-departmental courses. (Fac Sen AY0607 charge)

11. Complete a self-assessment using criteria provided by the Faculty Senate. (Fac. Senate mtg, 10 Sep 07)

### Review Campus Policies

12. Review changing the present campus harassment policy into harassment and sexual misconduct policy. (Fac. Senate mtg, 10 Sep 07)

13. Review the policy on background checks of Human Resources. (PSC mtg, May 07)

14. Review the policy on shared faculty appointments of the academic vice president. (PSC mtg, 07 Sep 07)

### Inter-Standing Committee Communication

15. Converse with the Faculty Advancement Committee on issues of mutual concern identified by the FAC in its year-end report of AY0607. (Fac. Senate, 10 Sep 07)

### Carry Over Business from AY0607 not charged by Senate

16. Respond to Dean's query about the propriety of having an Associate Dean conduct faculty evaluations that do not currently involve the Faculty Advancement Committee (full professor streamlined reviews). (*Dean's Letter 4/07/07*)

### Issues recently raised, not charged by Faculty Senate

17. Clarify whether an evaluation letter from a retired faculty member should be processed as an outside letter (requiring availability to department members) or a faculty letter (able to be sent directly to Dean/FAC). (Email to Dean, 26 Jun 07)

18. Examine system for consistency between faculty appointment letters and evaluation criteria for interdepartmental appointments. (PSC mtg, 7 Sep 07)

19. Clarify the relative privacy of first and second year new faculty evaluation chair letters: may draft and final versions be shared with the department as a whole? (Email to Dean, 12 Sep 07)