

University of Puget Sound
Professional Standards Committee
Minutes of meeting on 4 February 2013, 8:00, a.m., Wyatt 225

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

The meeting was called to order at 8:01 a.m., by Seth Weinberger.

1. Approval of minutes of 1-28-13

The minutes were approved unanimously.

2. Update on the draft for *Responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct*

Seth reported to the committee that several aspects about the wording in this draft are still under review. Topics still in need of clarification are the timeline for the investigation. Specifically the question whether or not the 30 days that the person under investigation has to respond to the decision is included in the 120 days limit for the investigation still needs to be addressed.

3. Discussion on the draft document about the interpretation on consensual sexual relationships.

It was clarified that the request to put in place documentation about potential professional implications of consensual sexual relationships (CSR) between faculty members (or faculty and staff members) originated with the Faculty Senate. The senate charged the PSC specifically to clarify any questions surrounding the involvement of faculty members in reviews of other faculty members, with whom they may have a CSR.

A question was raised about the following section of the current draft: "...the university strongly encourages faculty members to refrain from engaging in consensual sexual relationships." It was suggested instead to use language like "cautions faculty members about the implications of a CSR."

The committee discussed the appropriateness of the term "supervisory role" in the context of CSRs. The question was raised if a true supervisory role ever exists between faculty colleagues, even in a chair non-chair relationship.

It was emphasized that the main point of the draft document is to encourage openness about any CSR (rather than to discourage CSRs) so that conflicts of interest can be prevented before they arise.

The question was raised who should report a CSR when one of the members in the CSR is in a supervisory role relative to the other member. The committee seemed to agree that both members should feel like they are responsible for the disclosure. Notification would

first go to the department chair. If the chair was involved in the CSR then the next level of notification would be the Academic VP. Addition of language to the draft was suggested that could be something like: “If a faculty member in a CSR has concerns regarding his/her obligations under this policy, they are encouraged to speak with their Department Chair, or the appropriate Dean.”

The following language was offered to clarify how a CSR would affect hiring: “No faculty member should participate in the hiring of another faculty member, in which the person with whom the faculty member has a CSR is an applicant.” There were no objections to this addition by the committee members.

It was suggested that the text explicitly state that a “supervisory role” is in place during evaluations, especially if there is change of status or promotion involved.

It was suggested that the text state that any decision making process involving members in a CSR, where one member is in a position to impart favorable terms (e.g. budgetary or scheduling) on the other member of the CSR, should at least involve someone in addition to the supervisor if the supervisor is in a CSR with someone who could benefit from the supervisor’s decision.

The committee spent time discussing the best term for the target group of this draft document. Should the term be “CSR” or should the phrase include terms such as “romantic” or “intimate” instead of “sexual”?

The committee made no decisions in any matter of the draft document and will pick up the discussion during the next meeting. Jennifer was tasked to draft a new statement, which would start from a more positive framework of avoiding bias.

The meeting adjourned at 8:51 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Andreas Madlung