

Minutes of the Professional Standards Committee
February 24, 2015

Present: Kris Bartanen, Geoffrey Block, Betsy Kirkpatrick, Tiffany MacBain (chair), Andreas Madlung, Mark Reinitz, and Amy Spivey

MacBain called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m.

I. The minutes of Feb. 17 meeting have not been sent out yet. Mark said that he would compile them before the March 3 meeting.

II. The committee continued evaluation of a revised version of the Statement of Evaluation Criteria and Standards for the Department of French Studies, and determined that more revision of the statement is necessary. Chair MacBain will contact the department in order to communicate the committee's recommendations.

III. The committee continued its conversation about the following Senate charge: Review the PSC "Unified interpretation of Chapter III, Sections 4, a (1) and 4, a (c). Letters of Evaluation from Persons Outside the Department" to determine if the language on outside letters should be updated for: (a) distinctions of submission process for different types of letters (e.g., letters from co-authors, mentors, reviewers); (b) processes of solicitation of letter writers; (c) dates of submission of outside letters for departmental review; (d) expectations of outside letters; and (e) any additional questions raised in PSC conversations.

Chair MacBain reminded the committee that we had already decided that item "(c) dates of submission" is fine as it stands.

The committee discussed Item 1 on page 48 of the Interpretations to the Faculty Code, which reads, "The faculty member being evaluated may include any documents she or he wishes into the evaluation file. Thus, evaluatees wishing to guarantee the inclusion of outside letters into the evaluation file can receive those letters and put them in the file before it is submitted for consideration by departmental colleagues." The committee recalled that on Feb. 17, they had discussed the fact that if an evaluatee receives an outside letter, reads it, and puts it in their evaluation file, then the letter can be treated like any other piece of evidence in the evaluation file. Readers might choose to treat such a letter as having less weight than a letter sent directly to the head officer, but that would depend on the identity of the letter writer and the content of the letter. Today, the committee chose not to change the wording of Item 1.

The committee considered Item 2 on page 48 of the Interpretations to the Faculty Code. We agreed to change the phrase "confidential letters" on line 17 of page 48 to "a closed file". On line 18 of page 48, we agreed to change "those individuals who submitted letters and a summary..." to "those individuals who submitted letters to the head officer and a summary...". In addition, the committee agreed that line 19 on page 48 should be changed from "Faculty Code: Chapter III, Section 4, b (2) (a) and Section 4, b (2) (b)" to "Faculty

Code: Chapter III, Section 4, b (2) (a) and Section 4, b (2) (e)”, in order to refer to the correct sections of the Faculty Code.

The meeting adjourned at 8:53 a.m..

Respectfully submitted,
Amy Spivey