

Professional Standards Committee Minutes

October 7, 2004

Members Present: Bill Breitenbach, Kris Bartanen, Sue Hannaford, Grace Kirchner, Sarah Moore, John Riegsecker, Keith Ward, Carolyn Weisz

The meeting was called to order at 8:00.

The minutes of the September 23rd (as revised) and the September 30th meetings were approved.

PSC Code Interpretations

The Committee completed and approved the changes to the PSC Interpretations of the Faculty Code. Breitenbach said he would forward the corrected/ updated document along with the edited version (with changes tracked) to the Faculty Senate.

As noted during the previous meeting, the Committee's discussion of the Code Interpretations again highlighted two areas that may warrant further consideration; the Committee, however, declined to take any action on such updates as they were substantive. These issues include: (1) updated language to include partners as well as spouses, (2) broader discussion and clarification on the topic of rebuttals. Bartanen also noted that the number of required class visitations for faculty evaluations was absent from this Code Interpretations document, and the Committee agreed that it may be useful to have this information documented in some form.

Discussion of Draft Response to Senate Concerning Code Interpretations

At the request of the Faculty Senate, the PSC began to examine methods for documenting Code Interpretations and responses to inquires that do not rise to the level of "significant merit." Breitenbach's draft response to this charge prompted a discussion that ultimately highlighted several questions and/ or tensions. First, what should be done in cases where such interpretations, if published, stand to compromise confidentiality or where interpretations are made in the context of a confidential matter? This led to a second question, namely, what is the purpose of such a document and how would such a document function? The Committee decided it would seek clarification from the Senate on these matters.

Working Days

The Committee then began its discussion of defining "working days." Continuing member of the PSC who were familiar with this issue from last year noted that a clear working definition is needed in order to ensure timely decision making and fair process in a number of contexts (e.g., tenure decisions). Ward suggested that it may be useful to consider dates used in adjunct contracts, and Riegsecker suggested that it may be useful to consider distinctions between "business days" and "teaching days." The committee decided to (1) consider the language used in the interpretation of absences for guidance, (2) model out the number of days needed for faculty evaluation and grievances to see how many days might be needed in the cases of multiple appeals and hearing boards.

Meeting adjourned at 8:50.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah Moore