

Attachment C

Professional Standards Committee

End-of-Academic-Year Report

9 May 2011

Prologue—In conformity with *Faculty Bylaws* (Article V, §5, C: “No later than the first week of each May, the chair of each standing committee, in consultation with the committee membership, shall develop and deliver to the Faculty Senate a written report summarizing committee actions, concerns, and suggestions for the committee's membership to consider during the next academic year.”), the chair of the Professional Standards Committee has developed in consultation with his committee and will deliver in person the following report.

Composition—The Professional Standards Committee (hereinafter, PSC) for Academic Year 2010-11 included Dean Kristine Bartanen, William H. Beardsley, Geoffrey Block, Alva W. Butcher, Julie Nelson Christoph, William Haltom, Andrew F. Rex, Michael Z. Spivey, and Lisa Fortlouis Wood. Professor Wood was on leave during Spring Semester. Haltom was elected chair for the academic year. Unlike academic year 2009-2010, the PSC divided into two four-person subcommittees for detailed work before decisions were ratified by the entire committee.

Charges and Dispositions—The Faculty Senate in its 27 September 2010 meeting approved five charges to the PSC.

Senate Charge	Committee Disposition
1. The PSC should clarify the process to be followed when an evaluatee makes informal and formal challenges to the evaluation conducted by a department, program, or school (Code Chapter IV, Section 4 b. (4)).	Charge executed. Please see PSC minutes for 7 April 2011.
2. The PSC should review the policy on Background Checks of Faculty, being drafted by the Human Resources Department.	The PSC awaits the draft of the policy. PSC suggests charge be re-issued for 2011-2012 academic year.
3. The PSC should review the “Research Misconduct Policy” document and suggest changes to existing documents as needed to achieve consistency among the various response processes in the case of research misconduct.	The PSC awaits document. PSC suggests charge be re-issued for 2011-2012 academic year.

<p>4. The PSC should improve the description in the Faculty Code of the grievance process when it occurs within a faculty evaluation [Chapter III, Section 4 f (1, 2)], and of the hearing board process [Chapter III, Section 6].</p>	<p>Charge executed.</p> <p>Please see PSC minutes for 18 November 2010.</p>
<p>5. Clarify the following matters in future editions of “the buff document”:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. In team-taught courses in which a faculty member only teaches a small segment of the course, should Instructor Evaluation Forms be administered at the conclusion of the faculty member’s participation in the course rather than waiting until after the 10th week? b. When an evaluation committee is formed, in accord with the Faculty Code, for a joint appointment, interdisciplinary appointment, or an evaluation in a very small department, we urge colleagues to be particularly vigilant about ensuring an on-going pattern of class visits in order to ensure a full basis from what to make an assessment. 	<p>Charge largely executed.</p> <p>The PSC formulated changes to “the buff document” that would clarify each matter.</p> <p>The PSC answered in the affirmative the question in Charge 5a. The PSC restated Charge 5b and suggested where that language might be inserted into “the buff document.”</p>

Other Business—The PSC also

1. reviewed and approved a letter sent to department chairs that outlined procedures for administering university Instructor Evaluation forms with an amendment regarding use of alternative “Form A” by faculty not required by upcoming evaluations to use the university’s official form;
2. reviewed changes to the Faculty Recruitment Guidelines in light of the online Employment Applicant Tracking System;
3. reviewed an inquiry from a faculty member regarding participation from afar in departmental deliberations for faculty evaluations;
4. counseled the Dean regarding participation via Skype in departmental deliberations in evaluating faculty and regarding procedures for writing a letter and voting or making a recommendation in a department evaluation while on leave;
5. determined PSC internal policy for dealing with departmental guidelines for evaluation, promotion, and tenure:

- a. the PSC is entitled but not obligated to review the entire set of guidelines, as opposed merely to reviewing changes since the last set of guidelines was approved,
 - b. department guidelines should be regularly reviewed by the PSC (albeit that the PSC remained unsure about the appropriate way to implement such a shift),
 - c. the PSC reiterates that its responsibility is to evaluate departmental guidelines rather than to adjudge how well departments are actually adhering to their guidelines, which is the job of the Faculty Advancement Committee,
 - d. the PSC does consider content of departmental guidelines in its reviews, but the PSC concerned itself primarily with clarity in the guidelines, and
 - e. the PSC recognizes that the individual departments are best able to determine appropriate evaluation standards in their respective disciplines or fields;
6. approved statement of standards and procedures for faculty evaluation of Physics and Politics and Government departments;
 7. consulted with English department regarding statement of standards and procedures for faculty evaluation;
 8. declared, in an informal interpretation of the Faculty Code and of practice, that newly approved departmental criteria for evaluation, tenure, and promotion take effect in at the beginning of the next academic year;
 9. expressed its opinion that the Code is sufficiently clear regarding ethical or other grievances that arise or may be raised during evaluation of faculty, but recommended that the following sentence be appended to the description of departmental evaluation processes in “the buff document:”

As indicated in the Faculty Code, Chapter III, Section 4, the evaluation process is designed to provide a substantial body of credible evidence in writing as the basis for a fair and impartial review. Moreover, “the evaluation process should be fair and ensure that adequate consideration is given the faculty member involved. Fairness and adequate consideration shall be achieved consistent with the criteria and procedures outlined in Chapter III, Sections 2-4.” Note that Chapter III, Section 4f requires that if, during an evaluation, a question or concern regarding ethical behavior is raised, the faculty member shall initiate a grievance process.
 10. proposed that “the buff document” (p. 15, item 6; p. 19, item 7e; and p. 19, item 8d) be modified to correspond to the language of the Faculty Code on p. 19 7/e;
 11. answered questions pertaining to formal and informal appeals of faculty evaluations, highlighting especially that a formal appeal may be filed only in case of an alleged Code violation, but an informal appeal has no such restriction (to be added to “the buff document”) and suggesting two additional reminders (see PSC minutes for 4-7-11, addendum);

12. read Chapter 1 of the *Faculty Code* to permit departments, programs, and schools to state expectations regarding tenure-line faculty different from expectations of non-tenure-line faculty but not to permit departments, programs, or schools to withhold from non-tenure-line faculty roles, rights, and responsibilities that are available for tenure-line faculty; and

Consulted with the dean regarding streamlined evaluations.