

**Professional Standards Committee Minutes**  
**February 4, 2005**

Members present: Kris Bartanen, Bill Breitenbach, Sue Hannaford, Grace Kirchner, Sarah Moore, John Riegsecker, Keith Ward, and Carolyn Weisz

The meeting was called to order at 11:00 am.

The minutes from the January 28, 2005 meeting were approved as written.

Breitenbach announced that the document clarifying “working days” had been sent to the Faculty Senate

**Instructor Evaluations**

The Committee continued its discussion concerning the absence of criteria for evaluating continuing instructors in Year 12. As noted in the minutes from the previous week, the PSC’s conversation centered on whether this type of evaluation reflected a change in status comparable to other types of evaluations (e.g., change from associate to full professor) or only a pay increase. Examination of several documents (e.g., Faculty Salary Committee’s Proposal for a New Salary Schedule for Instructors, Code interpretation of whether a five year evaluation of a full professor entails a status change), instructed the Committee’s discussion.

After some consideration, the PSC agreed that instructors would benefit from some type explanation regarding the criteria that would be used to evaluate their performance. Next, the committee considered how best to address these lack of criteria. Using the language from the Faculty Salary Committee’s document, it was decided that Bartanen, in consultation with the Faculty Salary Committee, would draft a statement that could be used to clarify these standards. Once completed, the PSC decided that it would review the draft and determine the next course of action.

**Other Business**

Following this decision, the PSC briefly discussed two remaining issues. Breitenbach announced that he had sent a reply to a person who had raised a question regarding whether the *Code* required a head officer to issue a minority recommendation when the head officer disagrees with the departmental recommendation. To this question, the Committee had determined that the *Code* did, in fact, require that such a minority recommendation be submitted. Moreover, the PSC concluded that the *Code* was clear on this point; thus, such an issue did not constitute an interpretation that rises to the standard of “significant merit.” The Committee agreed, however, that it might be useful to head officers to include an additional statement in the buff document that further reinforces this point.

Second, the Committee revisited the question of when the work of hearing boards is completed (Chapter III, Section 7). Kirchner said that she would attempt to draft another interpretation that clarified which party(ies) would be responsible for evaluating any

possible remedy offered by a hearing board.

Meeting was adjourned at 12:00.

Respectfully submitted,  
Sarah Moore