

Professional Standards Committee
Minutes
April 17, 2014

Members present: William Barry, Kristine Bartanen, Geoffrey Block, Douglas Cannon, Jennifer Hastings (Chair), Tiffany A. MacBain, Mark Reinitz, and Kurt Walls.

The meeting was called to order at 4:03, p.m., by Chair Hastings.

1. Update on Final Report

The chair thanked all who contributed to the editing of the final report prior to her oral presentation to the faculty senate on next Monday.

Two additional items to be added to the report-

- A. Regarding PSC proposal for changing evaluation schedule, we neglected to address ongoing instructors and recommend that they move to the same structure as tenure line after tenure.
- B. Recommendation for next year's charges to include the creation of an ad hoc committee composed of former FAC members and current PSC members to draft faculty code revisions regarding tenure line evaluations.

2. Approval of minutes

The minutes of April 10, 2014, with minor corrections, were approved unanimously.

3. Evaluation Guidelines for the Carruthers Chair

Discussion continued on the evaluation guidelines. Most of the conversation revolved around four issues-

- A. Revision of the sentence at the bottom of the first page to improve clarity, "However, the evaluatee will be expected to demonstrate high levels of professional growth and service because of the assignment of units to research and administrative duties."
- B. The concern with too specific language in the sentences starting with "Activities that fulfill this criterion include," In both a) and b) in section 2. With a recommendation to delete both unless the intention is for these exact activities to be done
- C. As the Carruthers Chair document will be an addendum to the Biology department evaluation guidelines it is suggested that this document more clearly delineates

where there is a difference between the Carruthers Chair evaluation and the standards for others in Biology.

D. Relabeling section 2c and making it 3.

The chair will send the committee's recommendations to the department including a realistic time frame to accomplish committee approval this year.

4. The Buff Document

It was brought to the attention of the committee that the so called "Buff Document" officially entitled Faculty Evaluation Criteria & Procedures does not include the word procedures in the title on-line thus is not searchable using the word procedure. After discussion the consensus was to change the name of the document to Faculty Evaluation Procedures & Criteria and the dean will ask that it be updated on the university's website. It was further suggested that there be a link to this document from the term "Buff Document"

Chair reminded The committee that we have previously approved language for the 2014-2015 version of this document regarding class visits and electronic submission of files.

Discussion then turned to the recommended lengths of evaluatee statements and of colleague's letters. Professors MacBain and Barry volunteered to compose a draft of recommendations and distribute to the committee for review prior to our next meeting.

5. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:02, p.m.

Our next meeting is scheduled for April 24th.

Respectfully submitted,
Kurt Walls