

Minutes of the Professional Standards Committee
November 18, 2011

Present: Kris Bartanen, Geoffrey Block, Alva Butcher (Chair), Leon Grunberg, Jennifer Hastings, Andrew Rex, Doug Sackman, and Seth Weinberger.

Chair Butcher called the meeting to order 2.06

Minutes for the November 11 meeting were approved.

The Committee discussed the role, purpose, and style of meeting minutes. Some members expressed the view that the minutes should have more detail, in order to provide an accurate record of deliberations that would be useful to members who could not attend as well as others. The issue of transparency was discussed in light of the committee's work, which often involves several meetings until a particular matter reaches resolution. Members also pointed out that there may be good reason to keep the minutes vague, for example, in grievance cases. A question of where our mandate to keep minutes came from was raised, and it was noted that in the Bylaws it states that committees are to "communicate fully, report fully, and inform fully" (Article V, Sect. 1). It was agreed that our minutes should in the future reflect the meeting's deliberations in greater detail.

Item 1 on the agenda was "Recommendation for the PSC from IRB regarding research misconduct." It was agreed that the subcommittee of Rex (Chair), Grunberg, and Hastings would consider this matter before our next meeting. Butcher agreed to locate and furnish the committee with a copy of the current misconduct policy.

Item 2 on the agenda was the matter of departmental policies regarding the use of course assistants. It was decided that chairs of departments who use course assistants would be asked for a copy of their policies and would be asked if they are aware of any issues regarding the use of course assistants. Bartanen was tasked with this responsibility.

Item 3 on the agenda was the report by the subcommittee of Block (Chair), Sackman and Weinberger. The PSC had noted a discrepancy between the Code and common practice regarding the responsibilities of various categories of non-tenure-line faculty in faculty reviews. It was the sentiment of the PSC that ultimately this matter would need to be addressed by the faculty. The PSC subcommittee was tasked with drafting a potential emendation to the Code that would clarify this matter. The subcommittee reported on its decision about where best to put such an emendation [Ch. 3; Sect 4; a(1): between (a) and (b)], and presented language for this potential Code revision. After deliberation, that proposed language was revised and simplified to indicate which categories of non-tenure line faculty would not participate in reviews.

One issue involved the current practice of instructors in reviews in various departments. The Committee identified the following departments as ones in which instructors have been employed: Physics, Math, Chemistry, Geology, English, Foreign Languages and Literature, Asian Languages and Culture, School of Education, OT, Biology. Committee members were tasked with investigating how the evaluation criteria for each department handles the role of instructors (Weinberger—Foreign Languages and Literature; Hastings—Education and OT;

Rex—Math and Chemistry; Grunberg—Biology; Sackman—Geology). It was also agreed that following this gathering of information and further discussion that the PSC would next communicate on this matter with its Senate liaison (Leslie Saucedo), and then place this item on the agenda for a future Faculty meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 3.08.

Respectfully submitted,

Doug Sackman