

**Professional Standards Committee
Minutes for October 11, 1995**

Members present: G. Block, W. Breitenbach, B. Goldstein, D. Potts, J. Riegsecker, K. Rousslang, T. Taranovski, L. Wood

Based upon suggestions and conclusions derived from the previous meeting, the committee took up discussion of chapter III of the Faculty Code, with an eye toward identifying vague or unclear procedures for evaluation of career faculty for promotion and tenure. After a general and abbreviated discussion of the distinction (or lack of distinction) between "standards" and "criteria," considerable attention was paid to the relationship between the evaluation procedures listed in the Faculty Code and the corresponding departmental evaluation procedures. For example, it is not clear from the Faculty Code that departments are required to have clear procedures outlined in their evaluation documents.

Among the words or phrases identified in Chapter III, sections 1-4 of the Faculty Code that may require clarification are: "deliberative procedures"

- "adequate consideration"
- "gather information"
- "university needs"
- "standards"
- "criteria"
- "sufficient degree of familiarity"
- "faculty file" [in particular, its contents]
- "summary letter(s)"
- "interpretation"

Following the discussion of unclear phrases, words, or procedures, members turned their attention to a definition of the purpose of the Faculty Code, and whether the Code should serve as the parent document upon which individual department documents are based, or whether it should be confined to a clear statement of evaluation procedures, with documents fleshing out details of standards and/or criteria to be provided by each department. Consideration was also given to the possibility that a clear statement of procedures and standards in the Faculty Code might obviate the need for additional department documents, or at least make department statements appendices to the Faculty Code.

The committee also reviewed a brief history of the PSC statement bearing the title "University Evaluation Criteria." This continuously revised letter was distributed by the PSC to all faculty up until a few years ago, but is now obsolete, with specific references to outdated categories such as "Personal and Professional Characteristics." The document was developed over many years in consultation with the Advancement Committee, and was provided to update "guidelines for evaluation procedures" as specified in Chapter III, Section 3-b of the Code.

Committee members more or less agreed that it should, in principle, be possible to develop ideal evaluation procedures to be spelled out in Chapter III of the code. The purpose of this exercise is to provide a checklist of the necessary documentation needed for a fair and impartial decision when a faculty member is eligible for a change of status. Members then agreed to provide one another e-mail summaries of their own individual, hypothetical, skeleton, Code documents by 3:00 Wednesday, October 18. At the chair's discretion, selected members will then summarize the input, and present the results at the next meeting, October 25.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
K. Rousslang

Next meeting: Wednesday, October 25, at 3:00 p.m. in the Shelmidine Room