

**Minutes of the Professional Standards Committee
February 3, 2011**

Present: Kris Bartanen, Bill Beardsley, Geoffrey Block, Alva Butcher, Julie Christoph, William Haltom (chair), Andy Rex, and Michael Spivey

Minutes: The meeting convened at 3:07 p.m. in Wyatt 326, and the minutes of January 26, 2011 were approved.

FAC Request: In November 2010 Kristine Bartanen forwarded a request from the FAC “that the PSC clarify between ‘the buff document’ and the Faculty Code” (Memorandum from Kris Bartanen to Bill Haltom, Chair, PSC, 11/21/2010): **Code, chapter III, section 4.b. (2) (e)—page 14: “The head office also shall provide an evaluatee who has chosen confidential letters with a summary of the letters submitted to the head officer.”** In a Memorandum from Julie Christoph to Haltom (1/27/2011), Christoph reported the following: “Our subcommittee [Bill Beardsley, Christoph, Andy Rex, and Mike Spivey] met and determined that the best course would be to make all references to letter summaries use the language of p. 19 7e.” The subcommittee 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. The proposal was approved by the PSC, and revised language will be added to the Buff document (aka Faculty Evaluation Criteria & Procedures) this summer.

P&G Evaluation Criteria: The PSC then turned to the response of David Sousa, chair, Politics and Government to the Politics and Government evaluation criteria (Memorandum from Sousa to the PSC, 1/21/2011). After some discussion the PSC was prepared to support and approve the P&G Evaluation document with the proviso that P&G express their understanding and consideration orally to Bill Haltom on related two points of possible concern. On the first point the PSC suggested that by deleting the words “to full professor” after “promotion” in 1a and 1b of the Teaching section of their Criteria for Evaluation, Tenure, and Promotion P&G could circumvent possible ambiguities regarding the wording in the first sentence of the Teaching section: “The Department regards excellent teaching as indispensable for promotion or tenure.” On the second point the PSC felt that P&G might be “boxing itself in” by demanding excellence and making such excellence “indispensable for tenure and promotion,” since this wording would subject pre-tenure promotions to the same standard as tenure promotions and promotions to full professor. The PSC brought this up because the current wording seemed to contradict the stated objective of P&G (“we do not wish to impose an excellence standard that is at odds with university standards”). The PSC had no problem approving the document as is if the P&G intended to exceed university standards in this case. It simply wanted P&G to be aware that the PSC noticed an apparent and perhaps inadvertent contradiction of its stated intention on this point.

The PSC decided to delay its discussion of another subcommittee report until next week, February 10, and due to various schedule conflicts, to cancel its meeting on February 17.

The meeting adjourned at 3:36 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Geoffrey Block

