

Minutes of the Professional Standards Committee
March 28, 2012

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

The Chair called the meeting to order at 11.02 a.m.

Alva began by noting some of the outstanding items on the PSC's docket, including: the review of the "stop the clock" policy; discussion of procedure for background checks (a task that cannot be begun until we hear from Human Resources); the review of the scientific misconduct policy in light of forthcoming changes in federal policy; a review of the relationship of the consensual sexual relationships provisions of the Campus Policy Prohibiting Discriminatory Harassment and Sexual Misconduct to the Faculty Code and evaluation procedures; a review of the English department's Criteria for Evaluation; code interpretation of evaluation procedures with respect to the role of "colleagues"; review/approval of evaluation forms used in the Physical Therapy department; review of departmental statements on the use of course assistants; an end-of-the-year review of the Faculty Evaluation Criteria & Procedures.

It was reported that a letter is currently being prepared for the legal department regarding the scientific misconduct policy.

The committee then began a discussion of the Delaying a Scheduled Evaluation policy (otherwise known as the "stop the clock" provision) and the way that it may be best conveyed to faculty involved in evaluations or faculty who may consider taking this option. The approved version of the "Medical, Family Leave & Disability Policies," as submitted by the subcommittee, was noted; it was reported that the proposed changes in language are currently under review by the university's legal counsel. After discussion, it was agreed that references to and explanation of the policy and the PSC's Code interpretation as it applies to the evaluation process would be added to the buff document on pgs. 3-4, and 20. Specifically, under the heading "delaying an evaluation," a notation would be added explaining that "delays to evaluation automatically may occur if faculty are granted leave under the Faculty Medical and Family Leave Policy and Faculty Disability Policy." It would be further noted at the end of that paragraph that "All delayed reviews should be treated procedurally in the same manner as regularly scheduled reviews and files shall be evaluated without prejudice as if the work were done in the normal period of service." In addition, the following language would be added to the "Checklist for Head Officers" (p. 20), under number 2: "The head officer should make clear to colleagues that any delayed review should be treated procedurally in the same manner as a regularly scheduled review and the file shall be evaluated without prejudice as if the work were done in the normal period of service."

The committee then took up discussion of a Code interpretation, specifically regarding Chapter III, Section 4- The role of "colleagues" in the evaluation process. The proposed Code evaluation reflected the committees' careful reading of the Code and discussions over the course of the year regarding just who, among the many categories of faculty colleagues, is required by the Code to participate in evaluations. Our discussion had centered on Chapter I, Section 2, of the Code which

explains that different categories of “non tenure line faculty” and that “the roles, rights and responsibilities” of these faculty are “the same as those of tenure-line faculty as described in Chapter 1 of the Faculty Code with exceptions as noted in this code.” In addition, in Chapter III, Section 4, those performing the evaluation are referred to as “colleagues.” The Committee decided that, for the purposes of evaluation, adjuncts and visiting faculty are not considered colleagues because their own evaluation process does not include other colleagues, just the Chair or Head Officer. The Committee discussed how the reasoning for the exclusion of adjuncts and visiting faculty was expressed in the Interpretation. Alva agreed to make revisions and circulate these to the Committee by email.

The February 29 minutes were approved.

The next meeting will be held on April 4. The meeting adjourned at 11.55am.

Respectfully Submitted,

Douglas Sackman