

DRAFT: MINUTES OF THE PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS COMMITTEE  
11/16/07

Present: Bartanen, Bodine, Christoph, Edgoose, Fields, Goldstein, Share, Tomlin (chair)

Call to Order at 11:03 AM

Announcements: Chair Tomlin noted that one meeting (November 30, 2007) remained before the December 4, 2007 faculty meeting (that meeting will include the first reading of the PSC-proposed Faculty Code "housekeeping" amendment package and the second reading of the PSC-proposed amendment regarding the role of the associate dean in streamlined evaluations). Tomlin noted that December 7 would likely be last PSC meeting this semester.

Dean Bartanen circulated a list of possible PSC meeting times for spring semester 2007. Fridays at 1 p.m. was deemed the most popular choice, to be confirmed by the Dean's office.

The minutes from November 2, 2007 were approved with minor changes.

Tomlin reported to the PSC about the appearance of Tomlin and Share at the Senate meeting of November 12. Both provided input to the Senate as it deliberates changes to the bylaws governing the PSC, and changes to the Faculty Code concerning the grievance process. Tomlin noted that the Senate is considering creating a committee, possibly separate from the PSC, to handle grievances, and is considering removing the Dean from one or both of those committees. Bartanen noted her opposition to the Dean being removed from the PSC, and endorsed the Senate proposal to put the current Bylaw language governing recusal in cases of conflict of interest into the grievance provisions in the Code. Tomlin noted that the Senate had its own list of housekeeping amendments, and that he will consult with the Senate to avoid overlap between the PSC list of changes and the Senate's list. The Senate's housekeeping amendments will likely be presented to the faculty at some later faculty meeting, and after the PSC's housekeeping amendments have been introduced.

The PSC then took up the subcommittee report (Christoph and Edgoose) regarding 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. The PSC then deliberated at length about a number of related issues related to this proposal:

- How should departments evaluate a colleague's teaching outside the department, especially in cases where the teaching is in areas outside of the expertise of department members? There appear to be several

models in place at the university. Some departments may largely ignore teaching outside of the department. Some departments may observe classes, review course materials, and read course evaluations from courses outside the department. In other cases departments may gain input about teaching outside the department from interdisciplinary subcommittees made up of colleagues from outside the department.

- How can faculty members be protected from the possibility of being hurt at evaluation time by teaching courses outside their department? For example, a tenure candidate might be damaged by negative evaluations about extra-departmental teaching that was not brought up at the third-year review. Faculty members who teach outside their departments may be stretching a bit to meet university needs, and that effort might not be sufficiently appreciated by department evaluators. Young faculty might feel torn between requests to teach within the department and requests to contribute to courses outside the department. How can faculty be evaluated fairly for their teaching efforts outside the department in cases where department members might prefer that the evaluatee not teach outside the department?

Tomlin suggested that given the complexity of the issue it might be wise to survey department chairs and find out how departments currently handle the problem. It was agreed that chairs would be surveyed at the next department chairs meeting, on Wednesday, November 28<sup>th</sup>, at 8 a.m. The discussion of Charge 10 was suspended pending a report back from that meeting.

Tomlin then noted that of the list of PSC charges deemed high or medium priorities, numbers 10 (in progress), 18 (subcommittee report is ready), and 20 remained. Charge 5, a low priority item, was ready for PSC discussion as well.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:03.

Respectfully submitted,

Don Share