

## PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS COMMITTEE MINUTES

October 30, 2014, 8:30 a.m., Wyatt 226

Present: Kris Bartanen, Geoffrey Block, Douglas Cannon, Betsy Kirkpatrick, Tiffany Aldrich MacBain (Chair), Andreas Madlung, Mark Reinitz, Amy Spivey

The meeting convened at 8:32 a.m.

- I. The minutes of October 9 were approved as revised on line..
- II. Action on the French Studies Evaluation Criteria is postponed till a later meeting.
- IIIa. Code Interpretations addressing matters of evaluation

Page 45, line 3. A wording change was agreed upon: “department head” becomes “head of department, school, or program.”

There was discussion as to whether these changes would be subject to approval by the Faculty Senate and by the Board of Trustees, in accordance with Ch. I, Part G (p. 7) of the Code. It was agreed that changes of wording would be so subject.

There appear on Page 46, lines 46 and 51, the words “spouse” and “spouses”, and on line 52, the word “mates”. We will return to consideration of these in congress with passages concerning faculty relationships with students, staff, or faculty.

On Page 47, line 32 – 33 occurs the sentence, “Photocopies of the letters will not be made from the faculty members file itself.” It was agreed that this language has become technologically obsolete with the availability of cameras and other copying devices. There seemed to be no objection to transcribing letters word for word by hand, but that led to discussion as to the intent of the passage. Bartanen will ask John Finney to retrieve from University Archives the minutes of the meeting in which the interpretation was adopted.

On Page 48, line 30, a “Note” to an Interpretation specifies that “a letter of evaluation is a document submitted in paper form bearing the signature of the author.” The intent of the Note seems to be to rule out e-mail messages, but less clear is the standing of documents attached to e-mails, or faxed, in either case bearing a signature that perhaps is an electronic image. In practice such letters have been printed and included in the evaluatee file in paper form. Bartanen will consult Human Resources as to what in their practice constitutes a signed document. The Committee arrived at no decision, but scheduled further discussion in connection with the Charge to review the PSC unified interpretation concerning letters of evaluation from persons outside the department.

Page 49, line 20, concerns sexual harassment policy. The Committee will address this Interpretation when it addresses faculty relationships of a sexual nature more generally.

IIIc. Miscellaneous Code Interpretations

Page 39, line 8, says, "This Appendix contains current interpretations". In fact the Appendix also contains, for the historical record, interpretations that are "no longer active". Change the sentence to, "This Appendix records such interpretations," referring to the earlier sentence, ". . . the Professional Standards Committee shall make interpretations . . .".

IV. Adjournment. The meeting adjourned at 9:21, a.m. The Committee will next meet on Thursday, November 6.

Respectfully submitted,

Douglas Cannon