

DRAFT: MINUTES OF THE PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS COMMITTEE
11/02/07

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

Call to Order at 11:02 AM

Announcements: George Tomlin will be absent next week; there will be no meeting of the full PSC next week, while subcommittees continue to carry on their work.

The question was raised regarding the status of Charge #20 (added to the original list), which concerns closed evaluation files and the number of summary letters required to be written by the head officer of the evaluation committee (1 grand summary, OR 1 summary each for internal letters only as well as another that also includes outside letters). This matter will be considered by the full PSC in the future.

The minutes from Oct. 27, with changes that Karl Fields will circulate, were M/S/P.

A great deal of discussion followed regarding clarification of the language, meaning, and intent of the proposed "housekeeping" amendment. Key issues that were raised include:

- 1) The relative authority of the PSC and the Board of Trustees for oversight and modification of the Code;
- 2) Whether there should be a standing amendment (for example, inserted into Chapter 1, Part F of the Code), or language added to each new amendment to the Code, regarding changes throughout the Code for (language) consistency with new amendments. In other words, should changes throughout the Code that would be necessary to ensure consistency with any new amendment be made before adoption of that new amendment, or after adoption;
- 3) Recognition that the placement of "housekeeping" chores in the Code amendment process has implications for the ability of the PSC to exert control over the passage of an amendment that may extend beyond its traditional role in the legislative process.

The "housekeeping" amendment (previously circulated) was altered, with item #4 being removed. This amendment, along with others, will be forwarded to the Faculty Senate for consideration.

George Tomlin reported on the first reading to the Faculty last Monday on the issue of Associate Deans serving in lieu of the Dean in streamlined faculty evaluations, and he summarized some of the pros and cons to that proposed alternative review process that were raised at that meeting.

Julian and Julie reported on their work on our Charge #10; they circulated a handout that included proposed language that would be added to the "buff document" on item #1, page

15, concerning a checklist for head officers when a faculty evaluation includes non-departmental class visits. Discussion of this item will continue at the next meeting of the PSC.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:04.

Respectfully submitted,

Barry Goldstein, Geology