

Minutes of the Professional Standards Committee
October 29, 2015

Present: Mark Reinitz (Chair), Kris Bartanen, Tiffany MacBain, Garrett Milam, Jennifer Neighbors, Amy Odegard, Kurt Walls and Matt Warning.

The meeting was called to order at 2:35 p.m.

The minutes from the October 22, 2015 meeting were approved as drafted and revised

Old Business:

Interpretations to the Faculty Code related to Title IX –

The committee discussed scheduling the visit of Michael Benitez (Dean of Diversity and Inclusion, Chief Diversity Officer and Title IX Officer for Puget Sound) to coincide with that of Alisa Kessel (Associate Professor of Politics and Government). Professor Kessel's research on the concept of consent in the context of rape and other forms of sexual violence complements the expertise of Dean Benitez in the discussion of consensual faculty-student relationships. The committee intends to invite both to the November 19th meeting. At our November 12th meeting, the committee members will prepare questions to frame the discussion with Dean Benitez and Professor Kessel.

Discussion of language in faculty code regarding criteria for promotion to Full Professor

The committee chair circulated proposed language of a survey, developed by Dean Bartanen and Ellen Peters (Director of Institutional Research and Retention), to be distributed to department chairs. The survey is designed to capture existing interpretations of the phrase,

Advancement to the rank of full professor is contingent upon evidence of distinguished service in addition to sustained growth in the above-mentioned areas.

and to provide a forum for ideas on the appropriate weight of service in full professor promotion decisions. Committee members added language encouraging chairs to reflect the prevailing culture of their departments. The committee chair will send the revised survey to Ellen Peters for distribution to faculty chairs.

New Business:

Discussion of logistics and relevant considerations in creating a proposed cycle of review for department and program faculty evaluation criteria.

There is currently no review cycle for departmental evaluation guidelines. The Faculty Senate charged the committee with exploring the advisability of such a cycle. At present, departmental guidelines generally come up for review on an *ad hoc* basis, sometimes in response to changes in the Faculty Code, but also in response to changing priorities in departments. The discussion centered on whether there was a need for a fixed review process, and on the mechanics of such a process if one were created.

A committee member wondered if guidelines necessarily needed to be revisited often in the absence of changes to the code. A committee member noted that significant concerns are

the possibility of guidelines diverging across departments or guidelines being changed near to the review of a faculty member.

A committee member suggested that if a review cycle is created, a rolling schedule should be used to better spread the workload of the committee. A committee member offered that departments could be given the option of indicating “no change” rather than going through a full review.

The committee was generally in support of the idea of a review cycle for departmental guidelines but chose to table the issue until other questions, including the ambiguity of language in the university guidelines, are resolved.

This discussion led the chair to ask whether the committee should charge itself in spring 2016 with reviewing the university evaluation guidelines. This matter will be considered at the November 12th meeting.

The committee will not meet November 5th because three members will be attending academic conferences.

The meeting adjourned at 3:27 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Matt Warning