

Minutes of the Professional Standards Committee:
February 5, 2007

PRESENT: Sigrun Bodine, Doug Cannon, Julian Edgoose, Karl Fields, Grace Kirchner, George Tomlin.

Kirchner convened the meeting at 11:06 am.

A discussion of the minutes of the January 29, 2007 meeting indicated a need for a revision which will be drafted by the next meeting.

Announcements: Kirchner announced that the School of Education has been notified of the acceptance of the revised evaluation guidelines by the PSC.

There was no new business.

The PSC turned to a discussion of Chapter III, Sections 6 and 7, of the Faculty Code. It was recalled that the PSC spent considerable time and effort during AY 2005-2006 drafting a proposed amendment to Chapter III, Sections 6 and 7, concerning procedures for appeals and hearings. It was further recalled that the amendment was discussed by the faculty in a series of faculty meetings in AY 2005-2006 and that the amendment was returned to the PSC. PSC members remembered the following three topics as being controversial within the faculty:

- (1) confidentiality of hearing board matters
- (2) role and authority of a hearing board
- (3) possibility of several appeals on the same level.

However, the proposed amendment also seemed to contain undisputed changes for improving the existing Code language, and the PSC decided after discussion to explore the possibility of taking some of these changes back to the faculty in the form of a proposed amendment to the Code. In this context, reviewing the Report from the Ad Hoc Committee on Professional Standards from Oct 31, 2006 for possible suggestions was also recommended.

The remainder of the meeting was spent further discussing a proposed interpretation of the Faculty Code regarding early tenure and promotion (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)

First discussed was the question of "late tenure" i.e., could a faculty member whose initial contract specified a tenure review in the fifth year request a deferment until the sixth year? PSC members agreed that in their interpretation of the code such a deferment was only possible due to medical and other approved leaves, but not in the case of a discretionary deferment.

After some discussion, PSC members agreed to the following draft of the proposed interpretation:

“The expected times of tenure and promotion are framed by the Faculty Code (Chapter IV, Section 1, e and Section 2, b). This expected time may be further specified in the candidate’s appointment letter (what the Faculty Code calls the “initial contract”). Early promotion or tenure refers only to situations where faculty members choose to apply for promotion or tenure earlier than this expected time.

In cases of early promotion or tenure, the “sustained record of achievement of exceptional merit in all the categories by which a faculty member is evaluated” (Faculty Code Interpretation of Chapter IV, Section 2, b (4), February 9 1987) is interpreted to indicate a standard above and beyond that normally required for promotion and tenure.”

It was agreed that members would reflect on this wording and that the discussion would continue next week.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:55 am.

Respectfully submitted,

Sigrun Bodine