

Minutes of the Professional Standards Committee

February 5, 2010

Present: Kris Bartanen, Rob Beezer, Geoffrey Block, Alva Butcher, Jo Crane, William Haltom (Chair)

Convened: The meeting convened at 2:02 P.M. in Wyatt 226.

Minutes:

1. Minutes of the January 29, 2010 meeting were approved with minor modifications.
2. The committee formally received two charges from the Faculty Senate, as contained in the minutes of their November 23, 2009 meeting.
3. The first Faculty Senate charge asks the PSC "to consult with members of the FAC since 2005 about the impact of the 2005 decision by faculty to allow open tenure files." The committee discussed how to approach such a consultation, accompanied by solicited background information from Dean Bartanen on evaluation procedures that involve the Faculty Advancement Committee.

This charge originates in concerns expressed in year-end reports of the FAC for 2007-08 and 2008-09. These reports will be distributed to members of the PSC by the Chair.

The Dean's Office will compile proportions of open and closed files, for tenure and other evaluations, from 2004 onward, for the committee's information. The Dean's Office will also provide rosters of FAC membership for use by the PSC in selecting former members to consult.

4. The second Faculty Senate charge asked the PSC to "to review Option A of the proposed revision of the evaluation forms with the aim of identifying potential problems for the broader evaluation process and to report findings, if any, to the senate." Copies of the Option A forms will be distributed to the committee for their review, so as to expeditiously consider them as charged at a future meeting of the committee.
5. Editorial changes to Section 15 of the Faculty Recruitment Guidelines were presented to the committee and further refined. This completed approval by the committee of this section, and changes to the companion "The Departmental Evaluation Process" section of the Faculty Evaluation Criteria and Procedures discussed at the last meeting. Revised sections are appended to these minutes.

Adjourned: at 2:57 P.M.

Rob Beezer

15. Employment Offer

After interviews with finalist candidates, the Search Committee selects an individual to recommend to the Academic Vice President who, along with the President, has final responsibility for the decision. (Note: If a candidate selected is not a United States citizen or permanent resident, contact the Employment Coordinator in Human Resources for information about relevant visa procedures.)

Following acceptance of an employment offer, the Academic Vice President will issue an appointment letter to the successful candidate. In the case of a joint appointment or interdisciplinary appointment, the following issues should be considered for inclusion in the hiring letter by the Dean, Appointee, and Chairs and/or Directors of appropriate departments and programs:

- 1) Specification of the Department Evaluation Guidelines to be followed (the "home" department), in addition to any addenda, including a time frame for development of any addenda and submission to the PSC for approval;
- 2) Specific information about the evaluation committee, stating how many faculty from each program or department will be represented on each committee, as well as the time frame for designating specific faculty members to fill those committee slots for each evaluation;
- 3) The division of teaching responsibilities between the home department and any other programs and departments; and
- 4) Any specific requirements for University and/or department and/or program service.

Once the signed appointment letter has been returned, the Academic Vice President's office will notify the Chair of the department school or program, chair of the search committee, and the Employment Coordinator. The Academic Vice President's office will also notify the department, school, or program faculty of the appointment. This should include provisions relevant to teaching and the evaluation schedule and procedures.

At this point, the chair of the search committee should notify, usually by phone, finalist candidates who were brought to campus for interviews but not offered a position. The chair should return the original application materials for all candidates in the applicant pool to Human Resources. The chair should also send original application materials for the candidate hired to fill the position under separate cover to the Employment Coordinator to be included in the new faculty member's personnel file. Confidential materials in any format associated with the search should be disposed of in a secure manner.

Human Resources serves as custodian for all application materials. These must be maintained on file for two years to comply with federal law.

THE DEPARTMENTAL EVALUATION PROCESS

The instructions in this section should be followed for all non-streamlined 3- or 5-year evaluations, as well as for all tenure and promotion evaluations. If you have any questions, please consult the Professional Standards Committee, the Faculty Advancement Committee, or the Dean.

General instructions for the head officer. As stated in the *Faculty Code*, the responsibility for building a file and documenting a case for tenure or promotion rests upon the individual being evaluated and the department or school. The head officer will need to do some background work in the summer and be prepared to move quickly in the fall. The process is a long one and, as a result, the due dates are early. This means that faculty being evaluated for tenure or promotion will need to get their material to the department by **AUGUST 28, 2009** (by agreement with the faculty member being evaluated, an alternative deadline for submitting the file within the department may be established so long as it falls at least one month prior to the date the full evaluation file is due in the Dean's Office) so that the department can hold its deliberations and meet the deadlines. The head officer should read carefully Chapter III of the *Faculty Code*. Of particular importance are Sections 3, 4 and 5, and interpretations regarding "working days" and regarding Chapters III and IV of the *Code* contained in the appendix to the *Code*. The head officer should also be aware of any special provisions for the evaluation process that were specified in the appointment letter.

Evaluation of a head officer. When the head officer is the subject of the evaluation, the other tenure-line faculty of that unit will select some person to perform the functions that the head officer performs (Chapter III, Section 4a(3)(b) of the *Code*). Such person may be a member of that unit or may, in the case of a small department, be a faculty member of a related department.

Evaluation of a joint appointment or interdisciplinary appointment. When a faculty member being evaluated is jointly appointed in more than one department, or has significant teaching responsibility in an interdisciplinary program, there may be more than one evaluation committee. (Chapter III, Section 4a(3)(c) of the *Faculty Code*)

When a faculty member is appointed fully in an interdisciplinary position, composition of an evaluation committee and selection of the person who will function as head officer will be determined by the dean in consultation with the evaluatee. (Chapter III, Section 4a(3)(d) of the *Faculty Code*)

Variations in evaluation procedures should follow those specified in the appointment letter. These could include the following:

- 1) Specification of the Department Evaluation Guidelines to be followed (the "home" department), in addition to any addenda, including a time frame for development of any addenda and submission to the PSC for approval.
- 2) Specific information about the evaluation committee, stating how many faculty from each program or department will be represented on each committee, as well as the time frame for designating specific faculty members to fill those committee slots for each evaluation.
- 3) The division of teaching responsibilities between the home department and any other programs and departments.
- 4) Any specific requirements for University and/or department and/or program service.

Other Variations in procedures. Under the *Faculty Code*, questions that may arise about procedure may be addressed through mutual agreement: “Other variations in procedure are permitted provided they are mutually agreed to by the evaluatee, head officer, the Dean, and the Advancement Committee. At any time during the evaluation, these same parties may resolve questions about the departmental review process by mutual agreement in writing” (Chapter III, Section 4a(3)(e)). Faculty participating in the evaluation of departmental colleagues should discuss with the head officer the specific procedures to be followed in each case.