

Minutes of the Professional Standards Committee
October 9, 2006

PRESENT: Kris Bartanen, Sigrun Bodine, Doug Cannon, Julian Edgoose, Karl Fields, Grace Kirchner, Don Share, George Tomlin

Share convened the meeting shortly after 3:00 p.m.

The minutes of the October 2 meeting were approved as earlier distributed in their second draft. Share described the committee tradition of reporting discussion without naming contributors—in order to facilitate discussion and reasonable changes of mind. Final drafts of minutes are to be sent to Faculty Coms and to Priti Joshi, the Senate liaison.

As new business concerning streamlined evaluations, Dean Bartanen noted that the revised Faculty Code specifies that requests for streamlining be made two months in advance of the file deadline, and so by the end of June, a time when few faculty are thinking of this. She reported that she has been accepting late requests, including three or four very recent ones. The committee expressed no misgivings, recognizing that a full review can be conducted the following year if either the Dean or the head officer so requests. It was agreed that timely notification of the two-month date be amplified.

Concerning evaluation criteria recently submitted by Communication Studies, Tomlin and Cannon were appointed as a review subcommittee.

Concerning evaluation criteria for the Professor of Environmental Decision-Making and Policy, recently revised by Politics and Government in response to our review, Kirchner asked for an e-mail assessment of these latest revisions. In the event of no objection, the September 27, 2006, document will stand approved.

The committee resumed its discussion of evaluation criteria of the School of Education and of the Department of Foreign Languages and Literature. It was observed that the Code (Ch III, s. 3, p. b) calls for approval of departmental criteria by the committee without limiting the basis for that approval to issues of consistency with the Code; discussion ensued as to what the basis for approval or disapproval could be. The committee might act on its judgment as to the wisdom and fairness of policies in these documents. It was remarked that a subsequent committee might have a different judgment.

Discussion turned to the participation of differing categories of faculty in various phases of faculty evaluation. What is required where the Faculty Code speaks of “members of the department”? Particular expertise and knowledge of the culture of the department were both mentioned as relevant to the level of participation.

The subcommittee on Foreign Languages and Literature was asked to draft a response to their proposed revisions for committee consideration during its next meeting--to be held October 23. One member volunteered to survey the documents on file for each of the Schools and Departments and report on variations before that date.

The meeting was adjourned at about 4:00, p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Douglas Cannon