

Professional Standards Committee Minutes
October 14, 2004

Members present: Bartanen, Breitenbach, Hannaford, Kirchner, Moore, Riegsecker, Ward, Weisz.

The meeting was called to order at 8:00.

The minutes of the October 7, 2004 meeting were approved.

Breitenbach informed the committee that the revisions to Appendix B of the Faculty Code have been sent to the Faculty Senate.

Breitenbach announced that he had received the revised evaluation guidelines for OT/PT and Art. Since he had been on the subcommittee examining this document last year, Breitenbach will complete the review.

We have also received the evaluation guidelines from IPE. Ward and Weisz will review the document and report back on October 28.

Dean Bartanen raised a question about outside letters. Should a letter sent directly to the Dean's office by someone outside the university be included in the evaluation file if it does not arrive ten days prior to the file due date? Since the PSC interpretation of Chapter III, Sections 4A(1) and 4A(1)(C) of the Faculty Code (page 17 of Faculty Evaluation Criteria & Procedures, the "buff document") requires that outside letters be forwarded to the head officer, and that letters sent to the head officer should be sent at least ten working days before the file is due, the committee voted that such a letter should not be included in the file.

Dean Bartanen has received a request by a participant in a grievance for a copy of the summary of the hearing. Since the summary was included in the final report, and since the Faculty Code calls for the final report of the committee to be sent to the president, the committee believes that this request should be directed to the president.

The committee turned its attention to a discussion of the 2x2 (two visits by at least two people) rule for visits. It was observed that this rule is "in the air" but does not appear in the Faculty Code or in the buff document. Breitenbach located an October 23, 1998 memo from the PSC to the Mathematics department stating that having more than one visit by more than one colleague seemed a reasonable minimum.

After much discussion, the committee concluded that even though the FAC is charged with determining the adequacy of the number of visits, it would be helpful to include a formal interpretation in the buff document. Moore was charged with writing a draft that will be treated as an interpretation of merit and forwarded to the Senate.

Discussion continued from last week's meeting on how to respond to the Senate's request to document Faculty Code interpretations that arise in grievances or hearings. Breitenbach remarked that the minutes from the last Senate meeting resolved some issues raised last week, but that others remained. There was reluctance to maintain an internal list for PSC use and the committee decided to ask the Senate for more direction.

The committee reviewed a request from a faculty member requesting a one year delay in their five-year evaluation because it coincided with their sabbatical. It was noted that the Faculty Code says that professors are *normally* (emphasis added) evaluated every five years and that the matter was best left to the discretion of the Dean

The meeting adjourned at 8:51

Respectfully submitted,

John Riegsecker