

## **Minutes of the Professional Standards Committee**

April 4, 2008

PRESENT: Kris Bartanen, Sigrun Bodine, Julian Edgoose, Karl Fields, Barry Goldstein, Don Share, George Tomlin

Tomlin convened the meeting at 1:02 p.m.

### **1. Minutes from 28 March Meeting.**

These were approved after brief discussion; Goldstein will add headings.

### **2. Looking Ahead**

The chair led a discussion of the PSC schedule for the remainder of the year. The following schedule was determined:

- Today (4 April): #3 and #7
- Friday, 11 April: no meeting
- Friday, 18 April: charges #4, #6, #9 and if time, #18
- Friday, 25 April: charge #8 (and #18, if not completed on 18 April)
- Friday, 2 May: Work on the report to the Faculty Senate and the PSC self-assessment (including consideration of the proposal that the PSC be organized with both a chair and a vice-chair).

In the course of the discussion, various points were raised about several of these charges, including the following:

- It was agreed that charges #21, #22, #23, and #25 should be deferred to next year.
- We were reminded that charge #24 had been returned to the Faculty Senate.
- A subcommittee comprised of Bodine and Share agreed to pursue charge #4 (“lost interpretation”) and report back on 18 April.
- Bartanen agreed to bring back suggested placement and disposition of charge #18 (hiring and evaluation issues in multi-disciplinary appointment letters) with other suggested annual revisions to the “buff” document. It was noted that if the PSC determines that it should issue an interpretation, then this should be linked to departmental evaluation processes in Chapter 3 of the *Code*.

### **3. Charge #3: Interpretation of “spouse” and “mate” in Faculty Code Interpretations**

The PSC approved the following Interpretation of the Interpretations noted below for insertion into the *Code* Appendix at line 1 on page 39:

**(citations provided below); (Report to Faculty Senate DATE):**

In order to clarify provisions of the Code, inclusive of Code interpretations, the term “spouse” and the term “mate” mean spouse or domestic partner.

This interpretation applies to the term “spouse” and the term “mate” as they appear in these and any other places in the Code.

**Interpretation of Chapter I, Part C., Section 2, and Chapter I, Part D, Section 4.**

**Spouses/Children Taking Courses from Faculty (PS made voluntary 26 September 1986; accepted by Faculty Senate 3 November 1986)**

**Interpretation of Chapter III, Section 4. Department Discussion of Candidate’s Evaluation Being Attended by Candidate or Candidate’s Spouse who is also a Member of the Department (PSC Minutes 16 October 1989)**

Tomlin will deliver this to the Chair of the Faculty Senate.

**4. Charge #7: Interpretation of “Tenure-Line”**

The PSC began a discussion of this issue by considering a brief prepared by Edgoose on the issue. Matters raised included

- Why this issue came up in the first place? The PSC was reminded that it had first come up three years ago.
- What the considerations and status are and ought to be for those in tenure-line positions who have unsuccessful tenure or third-year reviews regarding colleague evaluations?
- Is the definition of tenure-line sufficiently clear?

It was decided that the Code’s definition of tenure-line, while not well worded, is sufficiently clear. The sense of the Committee was that faculty members who have been denied tenure and who have a terminal contract, as well as faculty emeriti, are not tenure-line members. The Committee discussed whether it would be useful to clarify this, and if so, how best to do so (i.e., via a Code amendment, some discussion in the buff document, or a Code amendment to make the definition of tenure-line faculty more precise).

The meeting was adjourned at 2:07

Submitted Respectfully,

Karl Fields