Professional Standards Committee
Minutes for November 15, 1995

Members present: Block, Breitenbach, Goldstein, Potts, Riegsecker, Rousslang, Taranovski, Wood

The chair called the meeting to order at 3:00. The minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

The committee continued the discussion of the possible university-wide procedure for evaluation (Breitenbach/Taranovski memo). There was support for the principle that each letter of evaluation, including the departmental recommendation, must contain a clear recommendation for a particular course of action. The departmental recommendation as well as summary of letters of evaluation and departmental deliberations should be contained in a single document. Department chair should not enfold his or her own letter of evaluation into the departmental recommendation, and it was considered most appropriate that chair submit a letter of evaluation along with those of other departmental colleagues. Departmental recommendation, if at all feasible, should be circulated to all individuals who participated in the departmental evaluation for their information and approval. "Double letters," e.g. one letter for the purposes of departmental evaluation and a different letter, perhaps with a different evaluation, to the Advancement Committee must be prohibited.

There was considerable discussion of exactly who does and/or should participate in the evaluation of a tenure-line faculty. What should be the role of the instructors? How could one prevent possible retaliation or conflict of interest? What is the best means of ensuring confidentiality, or, conversely, should all files, including tenure ones, be open? The committee reached no consensus on these issues.

Finally, the Committee raised the question of how should one evaluate individuals with shared appointments, or appointments that commit faculty members to teach in programs (core curriculum or interdisciplinary programs) outside of the department?

The meeting was adjourned at 4:10.

Respectfully submitted,
T. Taranovski