

Professional Standards Committee Minutes  
December 2, 2004

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

Bill Breitenbach called the meeting to order at 8:04.

The minutes of the November 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting were approved as amended.

Announcements from the Committee Chair

The formal code interpretation by PSC on delaying evaluations has been delivered to the Senate.

Questions were received from Mike Veseth regarding revisions to procedures in IPE's faculty evaluation document.

A report on the disposition of the inquiry about the definition of tenure-line faculty in faculty evaluation procedures (see the minutes from November 23<sup>rd</sup>) was sent to the department that initiated the inquiry.

Items of Business

1. Interpretation of "working days." Following discussion and further revision of a draft, the committee settled on the following interpretation, which will be forwarded to the Senate:

"Many processes described in the Code (such as but not limited to processes for appealing interpretations of the Code; for conducting evaluations; appeals of evaluations, and hearing boards; for dismissing a faculty member; and for conducting grievances) specify a particular number of "working days" during which a stage of the process is to be completed. In these Code processes, "working days" means those weekdays during the regular academic year (i.e., fall and spring semesters) when classes are in session, plus the weekdays of reading and final examination periods. If all parties consent, Code processes can proceed on non-working days. Completing one stage of a process during non-working days does not, however, oblige parties to complete all subsequent stages of the process during non-working days."

There are passages in the Code that refer only to "days." The committee decided to address the definition of "days" in a Code amendment at a future meeting.

2. IPE evaluation document. The committee received a note from Mike Veseth asking for advice on some procedural details in faculty evaluations for small departments. In the case of IPE, Mike's questions focused on the role of the IPE advisory committee and how small departments, in general, address the unique logistical challenges they

face in faculty evaluations. Following discussion, the committee determined that there is no code provision for the questions he asked. The committee recommends IPE talk with other small departments to gain an understanding of procedural possibilities and to submit a proposal to the PSC for review that makes sense to IPE and its particular situation.

3. The Senate's motion on what should be recorded in PSC minutes. The committee discussed the motion before the Senate, presently tabled, on content of the minutes submitted by PSC. The committee is concerned that discussions reported in the minutes become viewed as decisions or code interpretations. It also was concerned about balancing case-specific matters with general interpretations. For example, would general interpretations that might arise from confidential grievance hearings create inadvertent violations of confidentiality? The idea of posting interpretations periodically, similar to the way Curriculum Action Reports are done presently, was explored. The committee also thought that it would be helpful for the advice/rationale that accompanied the Senate's motion be part, in some form, of the motion. No conclusion was reached on responding to the Senate. The issue will be discussed further at the next meeting of the committee.

The meeting adjourned at 8:58.

Respectfully submitted,

Keith Ward