

PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS COMMITTEE MINUTES

January 27, 2015, 8:00 a.m., Wyatt 226

Present: Kris Bartanen, Geoffrey Block, Douglas Cannon, Betsy Kirkpatrick, Mark Reinitz, Amy Spivey

The meeting convened at 8:00 a.m.

- I. The minutes of December 4, 2014, were approved as distributed, with one spelling correction.
- II. In Chair MacBain's absence, Amy Spivey agreed to serve as chair of the meeting.
- III. Subcommittee assignments were confirmed as listed below. To give subcommittees time to meet, it was agreed that the next meeting of the entire Committee would be February 10.
Faculty evaluation guidelines, beginning with French Studies: Kirkpatrick and Reinitz. (Four departments will be submitting revisions, namely Asian Languages & Cultures, and French, German, and Hispanic Studies.)
Review Code and Buff Document re our recommended changes: Spivey and Block.
Revise Code Appendices, in accord with recommendations of Dean of Diversity and Human Resources Department: MacBain, Madlung, and Cannon.
- IV. Continued discussion of evaluation of digital scholarship.

The agenda had reminded the Committee that the minutes of October 9 recorded our initial discussion, but that no final decision was reached during that meeting.

Bartanen distributed an example of digital scholarship, a presentation explaining the construction of an online archive of editions of certain well-known folklore. It was evident that behind the presentation lay substantial efforts at mastering relevant software tools. Some faculty had expressed misgivings that comparable efforts on the part of junior faculty would be adequately recognized in the course of their evaluations. This again made vivid the question whether the Committee should (in the words of the Senate charge) "implement guidelines for the evaluation of such work."

There ensued a lengthy discussion. One member couldn't imagine guidelines issued by the Committee; departments would have to draft their own. Another said the Committee could offer a statement of support, perhaps with suggested language. Yet another worried that there might be resistance in some departments. It was observed that the issue might lie more with how digital scholarship would be presented and documented in a dossier, what would be the process for submission. Appealing to the example, one

insisted that departments would want to impose a ranking of professional contributions, valuing original research results over bibliographic tools, whether digital or more traditional in form.

Next came remarks about where a statement of support by the Committee would appear. It would not belong in the Code, and perhaps no changes would be required in departmental criteria. Could the Buff document include a statement?

Then broader issues arose. A comparison was made to developing educational tools, including tools for video display in the classroom. Have there emerged a wide variety of modes of professional and scholarly contribution, some a result of new technology? Would it be invidious to highlight the case of digital scholarship?

As time ran out, no action was taken.

V. Upcoming faculty meetings to consider changes to evaluation procedures.

The changes to evaluation procedures recommended by the Committee in its 2013-2014 report have been articulated in specific amendments to the Code, which Senator Bill Beardsley presented to the Faculty Senate. The Senate endorsed the amendments, and they will be proposed to the full faculty in a first reading on February 2. There will be two motions, one concerning Associate Professors who are not being considered for tenure or promotion, and the other concerning streamlined reviews for Professors.

VI. The meeting adjourned at 8:59, a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Douglas Cannon