

## Professional Standards Committee Minutes

February 25, 2005

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

The meeting was called to order at 11:00.

Minutes for the February 18, 2005 meeting were approved.

Bartanen reported that the Trustees concurred on the interpretation on delayed evaluations and on all revisions to the Code appendices, and that they would consider the interpretation on working days at their next meeting.

She also reported that she had confirmed that a Code interpretation that appeared to be missing from the appendix was, in fact, approved by the Board of Trustees on May 9, 1997, and that Jeff Johnson and John Finney will investigate if there are any other missing interpretations and will propose procedures to prevent future mishaps of this sort.

Breitenbach appointed Hannaford and Riegsecker to a subcommittee to review the evaluation guidelines for Environmental Studies.

Breitenbach suggested that we delay continuing the discussion of an interpretation regarding hearing boards.

The committee discussed proposed changes to the Comparative Sociology Department guidelines. It was decided to return the proposal to the department with recommendations for minor changes.

The committee then discussed a query by a faculty member regarding consideration of processes through which FAC members could be recused. It was decided to respond to provide guidance to the faculty member about channels for getting more input and/or moving forward toward a proposal for an amendment to the Faculty Bylaws.

Bartanen reported that she had sent a query to chairs of departments in which instructors might reach a 12-year evaluation, regarding their reactions to the policy statement regarding criteria for these evaluations. She had informed these Chairs that the word "promotion" in the statement was unfortunate, as the process does not correspond to a change of status as recognized by the Code, but to advancement on the salary scale. She noted that initial feedback to her query suggested that departments/Chairs felt that the language "more than satisfactory" as a criterion for a salary increase in these evaluations is problematic and that the language, instead, should parallel that for 5-year evaluations of Full Professors, which indicates that "satisfactory performance" is the criterion for advancement on the salary scale.

Meeting adjourned at 11:57.

Respectfully submitted,

Carolyn Weisz