

Attachment B

Professional Standards Committee

End-of-Academic-Year Report

30 April 2012

Prologue—In conformity with *Faculty Bylaws* (Article V, §5, C: “No later than the first week of each May, the chair of each standing committee, in consultation with the committee membership, shall develop and deliver to the Faculty Senate a written report summarizing committee actions, concerns, and suggestions for the committee's membership to consider during the next academic year.”) The chair of the Professional Standards Committee has developed in consultation with the committee and will deliver in person the following report.

Composition—The Professional Standards Committee (hereinafter, PSC) for Academic Year 2011-12 included Dean Kristine Bartanen, Geoffrey Block, Alva W. Butcher, Leon Grunberg, Jennifer Hastings, Andrew F. Rex, Douglas C. Sackman, and Seth Weinberger. Butcher was elected chair for the academic year. The PSC divided into two three-person subcommittees for detailed work before decisions were ratified by the entire committee.

Charges and Dispositions—The Faculty Senate in its 14 November 2011 meeting approved four charges to the PSC.

Charge One – The PSC should review the potential for more family-friendly “stop the clock” provisions related to the intersection of the timing of evaluations and personal medical, family medical, and/or parental leave. [Interpretation of Chapter III, Section 2. Delaying a Scheduled Evaluation (Report to Faculty Senate 18 November 2004)].

Charge executed. Please see PSC minutes for 4 April 2012.

The PSC sent an interpretation of the Faculty Code to the Senate which provides that delays to evaluation automatically may occur if faculty are granted leave under the “Faculty Medical and Family Leave Policy”. The PSC made revisions to the “Faculty Medical and Family Leave Policy” and added language to the “Faculty Evaluation Criteria & Procedures 2012-2013” to reflect the interpretation of the Faculty Code.

Charge Two – Review the policy on Background Checks of Faculty, being drafted by the Human Resources Department.

The PSC awaits the draft of the policy and suggests that the charge be reissued for the 2012-2013 academic year.

Charge Three - The PSC should review the “Research Misconduct Policy” document and suggest changes to existing documents as needed to achieve consistency among the various response processes in the case of research misconduct.

On February 22, 2012 the PSC met with Associate Dean Lisa Ferrari and IRB Chair Garrett Milam to discuss the document “University of Puget Sound Policy for Responding to Allegations of Scientific Misconduct (May 1997). The key areas of concern are anonymity for the whistle blower, inconsistencies of timelines for cases in which an inquiry/investigation covered by the misconduct policy also falls under the grievance procedure described in Chapter VI of the Faculty Code, and the expectation that the requirement for federal compliance might be expanded to all research if any research at the University is federally funded. The IRB recommended that cases involving allegations of research misconduct first be submitted for review under the current procedures of the Scientific Misconduct Policy. If unresolved issues remained a grievance process could be initiated as specified by the Faculty Code. The PSC referred some questions on these issues to the university’s legal counsel.

The PSC awaits the response from the university’s legal counsel and suggests that the charge be reissued for the 2012-2013 academic year.

Charge Four – The PSC should review how the following Campus Policy regarding consensual sexual relationships is applied with respect to supervisory responsibility and evaluation: “In accord with the University’s conflict of interest provisions, this policy prohibits faculty or staff members from exercising supervisory responsibility with respect to another faculty or staff member with whom they are involved in a consensual sexual relationship.”

Charge executed. Please see PSC minutes for 18 April 2012.

The PSC made an interpretation of the Faculty Code regarding professional ethics of faculty and relationships of a consensual sexual nature. This interpretation has been referred to the university’s legal counsel for review. The PSC awaits the response from legal counsel. Next fall the interpretation will be sent to the Faculty Senate.

Other Business—The PSC also addressed the following items:

1. reviewed and approved a letter sent to department chairs that outlined procedures for administering Instructor Evaluation forms;
2. reviewed and approved two evaluation forms for the School of Music
 - a. Music Ensemble
 - b. Applied Lessons;
3. reviewed and approved two evaluation forms for the School of Physical Therapy
 - a. Onsite Clinic

- b. Research Mentor;
4. sent an interpretation of Chapter III, Section 4 of the Faculty Code to the Faculty Senate which provides that adjuncts and visiting faculty should not participate in the evaluation of faculty;
 - a. Rationale

The proposed Code interpretation reflects the Committee's careful reading of the Code and discussions over the course of the year regarding just who, among the many categories of faculty colleagues, are required by the Code to participate in evaluations of faculty. Our discussion has centered on Chapter I, Section 2, of the code which defines the different categories of "non-tenure-line faculty" and states that their " roles, rights, and responsibilities" are "the same as those of tenure-line faculty as described in Chapter I of the Faculty Code with exceptions as noted in this code." In Chapter III, Section 4, those performing evaluations are referred to as "colleagues." The Committee decided an exception in the rights and responsibilities of adjuncts and visiting faculty exists in Chapter III with respect to evaluation because their evaluation process only includes the Chair or Head Officer.
5. added language to the "Faculty Evaluation Criteria & Procedures 2012-2013" to reflect the two interpretations of the Faculty Code;
6. reviewed and made recommendations to the English Department's "Statement of Criteria, Standards, and Procedures for Faculty Evaluation";
7. consulted with Dean Kris Bartanen on a process question regarding streamlined reviews;
8. began discussion on the Faculty Code provisions on Guidelines for the Use of Course Assistants and departmental statements on the use of course assistants (Interpretation of Chapter 1, Part C, Section 2.a.);
 - a. Rationale: The Faculty Advancement Committee has observed in recent files comments from students about challenges related to course assistants. At the same time, pedagogy in at least some areas of the curriculum has changed since 1986 when the Code interpretation was filed.
 - b. Departments using course assistants are: Art, Biology, Chemistry, Communication Studies, Comparative Sociology, Economics, Environmental Policy and Decision Making, Exercise Science, Geology, Math and Computer Science, Occupational Therapy, Philosophy, Physics, Psychology, and Physical Therapy.
 - c. The PSC suggests that this charge be reissued for the 2012-2013 academic year.