Minutes of the Professional Standards Committee
March 9, 2006

Present: Kris Bartanen, Bill Breitenbach, Karl Fields, Grace Kirchner, Sarah Moore, John Riegsecker, Don Share, Carolyn Weisz (chair)

PSC chair Weisz called the meeting to order at 2:00.

The minutes of March 2, 2006 were approved as revised.

REPORTS AND ANNOUNCMENTS

Weisz distributed a "side by side" version of the proposed code amendments (Chapter III, Sections 6 and 7) and asked committee members to review before the next meeting after which it would be distributed to all faculty in advance of the next faculty meeting. She then reported on the progress the amendments to the amendment had made at the previous faculty meeting: the original code language on confidentiality, the changes made to Section 7, and the minor "housekeeping" details were passed by the faculty. She noted that a full vote on the entire amendment had been postponed until the following faculty meeting.

CONTINUING BUSINESS

The PSC then turned its attention to the evaluation guidelines proposed by the Theater Arts Department. This revision was aimed at clarifying a few of the specific methods used to evaluate professional growth, and the PSC's comments to their document were minor. Because, however, the Committee had only read the subportions of the document that had been changed, they postponed a formal vote until a subcommittee could review the changes to ensure that they did not pose any inconsistencies with older, unchanged sections of the document. Share and Kirchner volunteered for this task.

Next, the Committee looked ahead to issues it would address at upcoming meetings. Weisz mentioned that the defining "tenure line faculty" in the Code was next on the agenda and asked committee members to review the minutes of February 9, 2006 where this topic had been discussed briefly. PSC members commented that this was a weighty and potentially difficult topic that was likely to require a Code amendment. We thought it wise perhaps first to identify the issues that frame this problem and seek input from the Faculty Senate. Revision of the "Buff Document" and correction of small "typos" and inaccurate code references were two additional tasks mentioned as needing attention before the end of the year.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:00.

Respectfully submitted,
Sarah Moore