

University of Puget Sound
Professional Standards Committee
7 November 2012, 8:30, a.m., Wyatt 225

Members present: Kris Bartanen, Doug Cannon, Jennifer Hastings, Pat Krueger, Doug Sackman, Kurt Walls, and Seth Weinberger

The meeting was called to order at 8:35, a.m., by Seth Weinberger.

I. Approval of minutes of 10-31-12

- a. Seth asked for clarification on the appendix, which was the draft communication to the School of Education. The committee affirmed that this draft correctly conveyed the sentiment of the committee. Seth will incorporate this information in an email to the School of Education. PSC will await resubmission.

II. Discussion on the responsibilities and roles of faculty members in participation in evaluation. (key talking points noted below)

- a. Seth began the discussion by asking for an explanation on how the current Faculty Code *could* be read to allow no independent recommendation
- b. An explanation was offered based on the fact that, as written, a recommendation is required *if* one exists—the point being pre-supposition.
- c. An opinion was offered that parliamentary procedure allows abstention when this is specifically articulated
- d. Counter point is that this is “not a vote”, although it works as one

Seth asked for two straw polls:

Does the faculty code as currently written not require an individual recommendation in the letter?

YES 3 NO 3

Should the faculty code allow for a letter to have no recommendation?

YES 3 NO 3

PSC is not in consensus as to the current meaning of the Faculty Code in this matter nor how, or if, the Faculty Code should allow abstention

Discussion continued (key talking points noted)

- e. Background information was asked for as to what occurrences have resulted in this charge coming to the PSC

- i. Kris provided some background on the actions of some departments in respect to the participation of junior faculty and questions that have also come from Chairs.
- f. The draft interpretation is appreciated by some committee members because it allows some flexibility for the individual
- g. Individual flexibility vs. responsibility was discussed
- h. Opinions were offered regarding the inappropriateness of asking first year faculty to make change of status recommendations
- i. Option of the letter writer situating his/herself and providing context for their information was suggested
- j. Inappropriateness of coercion – insisting upon a recommendation when an individual may not have one
- k. Difficulties which may occur with opening door to non-participation

Seth calls for closure and decision on how to proceed

After ~ 45 minutes of discussion the PSC is not in consensus on the meaning of the current text in the faculty code. Questions remain about what was the intent and what should be the practice.

Consensus was that this decision should not rest with the members in the room and more input is needed.

The PSC will proceed with the following plan:

1. Meet with the FAC on Nov 28th to get input on what the FAC sees as the scope of problem and potential resolution
2. Bring the issue to a spring faculty meeting to gain input from the faculty
3. Resume discussion after gathering this input.

Seth will determine whether or not there will be a meeting Wednesday, November 14th and e mail the committee. There will be no morning meeting on the 28th.

Meeting adjourned at 9:25, a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Hastings