

Professional Standards Committee Minutes
November 16, 2005

Members present: Kris Bartanen, Bill Breitenbach, Karl Fields, Grace Kirchner, Sarah Moore, John Riegsecker, Don Share, Carolyn Weisz, Nancy Bristow (Faculty Senate Liaison)

Chair Weisz called the meeting to order at 3:00 pm. The minutes of November 9, 2005 were approved.

Moore said she thought Business Leadership's guidelines should be ready for discussion the week of November 23.

Weisz and Breitenbach reported on their meeting with the Faculty Senate. The Senate discussed a memo from a faculty member about charges of plagiarism by a member of the faculty as reported by the student newspaper. Bristow reported that the Senate had voted to form a small task group to review the grievance process. The Senate had not reached a decision on the charges to the task group, and they were asking for input from the PSC.

There was uncertainty if the Senate's intent is to review specific past cases, or if the intent is to determine if the Faculty Code is adequate in dealing with dishonesty and plagiarism.

Since the Faculty Code does not provide a mechanism for lifting the requirement of confidentiality it imposes on grievance proceedings, it is unclear how a review of past cases would proceed. It was the consensus of the Committee that we should focus on the Faculty Code rather than on individual cases.

The Committee then discussed the role of the PSC in the Faculty Code in dealing with matters of dishonesty and plagiarism. Questions on dishonesty and plagiarism would generally come to the PSC from Chapter I, Part D, Section 4 of the Faculty Code (Professional Ethics) or through the grievance process defined in Chapter VI. If a matter of dishonesty or plagiarism was referred to the PSC from Chapter I, Part D, Section 4, then the Faculty Code says that the PSC may make a recommendation to the parties. If it came to the PSC as a grievance, then the PSC would hear the case and send its findings to the President. The PSC might also become involved in a matter of dishonesty or plagiarism through Chapter V of the Faculty Code if it led to dismissal from the University.

The committee briefly discussed having an appeals process in grievance proceedings, the idea (proposed by a senator) of having an ombudsman receive complaints about academic dishonesty, and if the thirty day limit in Chapter VI, Section 2.a was adequate. It was strongly urged that there be no ex parte exchanges in the grievance process. Finally, it was suggested that former members of the PSC would be a valuable resource,

and that the Senate task group might ask them if the Faculty code was adequate for handling cases of plagiarism and dishonesty and how the Code might be improved.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
John Riegsecker