

PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS COMMITTEE MINUTES

October 9, 2015, 8:30 a.m., Wyatt 326

Present: Kris Bartanen, Geoffrey Block, Betsy Kirkpatrick, Tiffany Aldrich MacBain (Chair), Andreas Madlung, Mark Reinitz, Amy Spivey

The meeting convened at 8:30 a.m.

Due to the fact that most members on the Committee did not have a final draft and considering several new adjustments to the minutes, the Committee decided to circulate the revised minutes of the October 2 meeting and to approve them via email prior to the next meeting on October 30.

The Committee then took up the first item in the agenda supplied by Chair Tiffany MacBain with her suggestion to “form working groups to review all interpretations of the Code” and to address the following questions: “Have any become obsolete by more recent interpretations” and “are all consistent with current practices and policies on campus”?

The Committee readily agreed to form two Sub-Committees in response to the Senate charge to review all interpretations of the Code. The first Sub-Committee, consisting of Doug Cannon, Betsy Kirkpatrick, Andreas Madlung, and Mark Reinitz, was assigned to review interpretations of the Code evaluation process (10 interpretations). The second Sub-Committee, consisting of Geoffrey Block, Tiffany MacBain, and Amy Spivey, was assigned to consider Code interpretations that pertain to faculty relationships (3-4 interpretations) and various issues that pertain to working days, course assistants, faculty misconduct, sexual harassment grievance, and discontinuation of school or program (5 total). The Committee agreed that the Sub-Committees would meet at the regular group meeting time during each of the next two weeks (Oct. 16 and Oct. 23) and consider such issues as inconsistencies in the Code that concern these topics and to bring their interpretations, questions, and conclusions regarding their assigned issues to the full Committee on October 30.

The Committee next took up the Senate charge to “review and consider endorsement of evaluation guidelines for faculty digital scholarship.”

- a. “**Rationale:** As digital scholarship becomes a more common component of faculty professional growth, it is desirable for Puget Sound to implement guidelines for evaluation of such work (see appended example).”
- b. **ACTION:** Read the policy draft shared by KB [Kris Bartanen]. Consider whether or not to endorse such guidelines for faculty digital scholarship.”

Kris Bartanen presented some background concerning this issue and its relevance to the PSC, after which discussion centered on the challenge of assessing the value of this relatively new and potentially misunderstood branch of scholarship. No one disputed the value of digital scholarship, but several felt that their lack of familiarity with digital scholarship within other disciplines led them to ask Chairs and departments to develop departmental guidelines for digital scholarship rather than for the PSC to create these guidelines.

In the process of the discussion various PSC members raised such issues as how the FAC would gain access to this scholarship and the necessity of placing the burden on evaluatees to explain the scholarly value of their digital scholarship, including how digital scholarship addresses such traditional measures of scholarship as peer review. At the end of the discussion the Committee did not decide “to endorse [such] guidelines for faculty digital scholarship” at this time but left open the possibility of returning to this issue at a later date.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:20 a.m. The next meeting will next meet on Thursday, October 30.

Respectfully submitted,

Geoffrey Block