

Professional Standards Committee Minutes – April 3, 2017

Present: Jennifer Neighbors (chair), Garrett Milam, Amanda Mifflin, Suzanne Holland, Matt Warning, Kris Bartanen, Fred Hamel, and Amy Odegard.

1. The committee approved minutes from the March 20, 2017 meeting with minor revisions.
2. Unanimous approval of suggested Rationale for Professional Ethics, interpretation of the Code, chapter 1, Part D, Section 4.a. (regulatory guidance). PSC does not consider this an interpretation of significant merit.
3. Unanimous approval of updated interpretation of Code per “intimate relationships” (chapter 1, Part C, Section 2 and Chapter 1, Part D, Section 4). Attached to these minutes is a document written by Professor Poppy Fry on behalf of the Sexual and Gender Violence Policy Subcommittee, clarifying the rationale for the use of the term “intimate” in law. PSC members found this document to be extremely helpful and suggest adding to the policy itself, the following: *“At no point in this policy is intimate used to describe acts or a relationship that might be considered as simply platonic. The Campus Policy Prohibiting Sexual Misconduct does not prohibit platonic friendship or mentorship between faculty and students.”* PSC does not consider this an interpretation of significant merit.
4. Discussion of “Side-by-side comparison: Current Campus Policy Prohibiting Harassment and Sexual Misconduct (CPPH&SM) and proposed Campus Policy Prohibiting Sexual Misconduct (CPPSM) and Campus Policy Prohibiting Harassment (CPPH).” PSM members voted unanimously to endorse and affirm the CPPH&SM.
5. Discussion of Bias in Evaluation Forms, as charged by Senate. In addition to SoundNet site on relevant literature on bias in teaching. Ideas: lowering the weight of student evaluation forms and put alternatives in place, and/or working toward helping the readers of the forms assess for bias in student comments and in reading of comments. Contact people at Kansas for data: idea@edu.org? Conduct a thorough investigation of evaluation alternatives? Revisit our current form for biases?

Minutes submitted by Suzanne Holland