

Minutes of the Professional Standards Committee
February 19, 2007

PRESENT: Kris Bartanen, Sigrun Bodine, Doug Cannon, Karl Fields, Grace Kirchner, George Tomlin

Kirchner convened the meeting at 11:05, a.m.

Kirchner announced that she had been contacted by a faculty member about whether confidentiality of departmental deliberations in faculty evaluations is addressed by the Faculty Code. A question had arisen regarding good-will discussions between individual faculty and evaluatees subsequent to these deliberations. To what extent are faculty constrained by considerations of confidentiality? It seemed to the faculty member that the Code does not speak to this. The Committee will take this up at a later meeting.

Kirchner also announced that she had an e-mail exchange with Barry Anton, Chair of the Faculty Senate, as to what charges to our Committee are entailed by the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the PSC. Anton will carry the question to the meeting of the Senate this afternoon.

The minutes of February 12, 2007, were approved as distributed by Edgoose, in the revised draft attached to his e-mail of 10:24, p.m., February 16.

Revisions to Chapter III of the Faculty Code:

Pursuant to our effort to gain faculty approval for some portion of the revisions drafted by the Committee during 2005-2006 and 2004-2005, Kirchner reported conversations with interested faculty as to what areas of controversy there are. She worried that the comprehensive character of the revisions is itself a risk. Planning to stay as close as possible to the current language in divisive areas, the Committee focussed its discussion on draft language for Section 7, paragraphs (h)–(l)—to replace current paragraphs (j)–(k).

It was agreed that we drop the second sentence of (i) (which read, “A hearing board may suggest, but cannot dictate or enforce, methods for correction of deficiencies.”) as well as the final clause of (l) (which read, “that the work of the hearing board has been completed”).

Shifting the last sentence of (i) (regarding moving the file forward to the next stage) and incorporating the current language (“that decision may include a direction”) into paragraphs (j) and (k) resulted in the following redraft of (i) through (m). (Note that this redraft has one more paragraph than the earlier proposed language.)

- i. Within ten (10) working days after completion of a hearing, the hearing board shall render its decision about whether violations of the code, as alleged by the appellant, have occurred. The decision of the majority of the hearing board and any dissent by a minority of the hearing board shall be transmitted in writing to the appellant, the respondent, and the dean. The hearing board’s majority decision, any minority dissents, and any exhibits received in the hearing, along

- with the appellant's list of alleged code violations, the respondent's response, and any dissents by members of the department, school, or program or by members of the Advancement Committee, are added to the evaluation file.
- j. If a hearing board determines that the code has been violated as alleged by the appellant in an appeal of the department, school, or program, the hearing board's decision may include a direction that the matter be returned to the department, school, or program for correction of deficiencies.
 - k. If a hearing board determines that the code has been violated as alleged by the appellant in an appeal of the evaluation by the Advancement Committee, the hearing board's decision may include a direction that the matter be returned to the Advancement Committee for correction of deficiencies.
 - l. If a hearing board does not find that the code has been violated as alleged by the appellant or, even though it finds code violations, does not direct that the file be returned to an earlier stage, then the file moves forward to the next stage of the evaluation process.
 - m. The chairperson of the hearing board shall deliver to the dean in a sealed envelope the electronic record of the hearing and copies of the hearing board's majority decision, any minority dissents, any exhibits received in the hearing, the appellant's list of alleged code violations, the respondent's response, and any dissents by members of the department, school, or program or by members of the Advancement Committee. The dean shall retain these materials for six years after the hearing board makes its report. After a hearing board has rendered its decision and transmitted its reports, the chairperson of the hearing board shall notify the chairpersons of the Faculty Senate and the Professional Standards Committee.

The Committee agreed to consider this redraft further in its next meeting

Kirchner asked the Committee members to review other parts of the proposed language for Chapter III to identify areas of controversy, in the interest of returning the proposed language to the faculty as a whole.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00, noon.

Respectfully submitted,

Douglas Cannon