

Minutes of the Professional Standards Committee

January 29, 2007

PRESENT: Kris Bartanen (arrived after first agenda item: self-recusal), Sigrun Bodine, Doug Cannon, Julian Edgoose, Karl Fields, Grace Kirchner, George Tomlin

Kirchner convened the meeting at 11:04 a.m.

The minutes for the January 22, 2007 meeting were approved.

Announcements. None

New Business.

Procedure for selection of a hearing board

Kirchner brought to the PSC some questions about the selection of hearing boards. She asked for confirmation of the number of faculty whose names should appear on the roster from which boards would be selected. Two names on the current roster were of faculty in their third year of the roster rotation and on leave; therefore, they were struck. Another name was that of a faculty member who has resigned. This name also was struck. Thus, enough names were added to the current year's cohort so that a total of 42 names appear, as specified by the Faculty Code. PSC members affirmed Kirchner's interpretation.

Kirchner reported that the most recent precedent appears to be not to distribute the roster to the parties in an appeal. Should the roster of names ever be released to one party to an appeal, then fairness would dictate that the other party also receive a copy of the roster.

There was further ancillary discussion about the desirability of resuscitating the proposal to amend the procedures for seating a hearing board, which had been before the faculty during five meetings in AY0506 without resolution. Items in dispute were the prohibition on "public statements" by participants in a hearing, the question of how many times an appellant could appeal a decision, and whether a hearing board would have the authority to enforce the remedies it suggests. Kirchner volunteered to examine faculty meeting minutes to ascertain the exact legislative status of the proposal and report to the PSC next week.

Dean Bartanen, having now arrived at the meeting, asked the PSC members if the sole Code or By-Laws change to be reported to the Academic Affairs committee of the Board of Trustees for their February meeting was the amendment to the language of the early retirement provision. All members said they believed so.

Old Business.

School of Education Evaluation Guidelines Revision

The revised School of Education guidelines were received and unanimously approved by the PSC.

Early Tenure

The remainder of the meeting was spent further discussing a proposed interpretation of the *Faculty Code* regarding early tenure and promotion that was drafted and circulated since the last PSC meeting, namely,

Interpretation of Chapter IV, Section 1, e and f; Chapter IV, Section 2, b(4); and the interpretation of Chapter IV, Section 2,b(4) of 9 February 1987: Early tenure and promotion. Date tba.

PSC members discussed exactly what we would be issuing if such a draft were to be approved by the committee. It was decided that it would be labeled a clarification of an earlier interpretation, and would itself be considered an interpretation of the Code. In effect it would amend the earlier interpretation.

Another contingency for the early tenure decision process was discussed, namely, could a faculty member whose initial contract specified a tenure review in the fifth year request a deferment until the sixth year? The Code allows deferments due to medical and other approved leaves, but no reference to a discretionary deferment could be found. The Dean remembered precedents in the realm of promotion, i.e., that a faculty member whose initial contract specified that consideration for promotion to associate professor be in the third year had requested a deferment until year six. Discussions will continue next week.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:03pm.

Respectfully submitted,

George Tomlin