

PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS COMMITTEE MINUTES  
November 6, 2014, 8:30 a.m., Wyatt 226

Present: Kris Bartanen, Betsy Kirkpatrick, Tiffany Aldrich MacBain (Chair), Andreas Madlung, Mark Reinitz

The meeting convened at 8:30 a.m.

- I. Because so few people were able to attend, we decided to approve the minutes of 10-30-14 via email.
- II. The committee continued its review of previous PSC Faculty Code interpretations
  - a. Working days (page 39)

Given that technology has evolved to the point where it is easy to search PDFs, and given the potentially incomplete nature over time of the list of references to “working days” in the Code presented in lines 23 through 48 of this interpretation, the committee decided to delete these lines from this interpretation.

- b. Course assistants (pages 40-41)

Committee members expressed concern about ambiguity in the text regarding when review of course assistant requirements should be carried out for each department. Three revisions were recommended:

- i. Excise reference to “regular” as there is no specific cycle.
    - ii. Line 44: period after “course assistants,” delete rest of sentence.
    - iii. Final sentence of interpretation: PSC will not request that departments submit revised guidelines. Instead, if the department revises its guidelines then they will be submitted to PSC for review. Tiffany will hone the language for next week.
  - c. Discontinuation of Dept., School, or Program (page 49)
    - i. No suggested changes
  - d. Interpretation of Sexual Harassment Grievances (page 49)

The Campus Policy Prohibiting Harassment and Sexual Misconduct specifically defines sexual harassment. It is current and adheres to legal guidelines. The interpretation on page 49 seems out of date and references staff position titles that have changed. The committee would like to forward this interpretation to Michael Benitez (Puget Sound’s Title IX Officer) for guidance regarding new federal regulations.

- e. Interpretation of Chapter I, Part C, Section 2 and Chapter I, Part D, Section 4. Professional ethics of faculty and relationships of a sexual nature (page 40) **AND** Interpretation of Chapter I, Part C, Section 2 and Chapter I, Part D, Section 4. Spouses/children taking courses from faculty (pages 41-42).

These two interpretations were considered together because they address similar issues and contain similar language. We recommend that the language be brought into consistency with the Campus Policy Prohibiting Harassment and Sexual Misconduct as that document is informed by current legal guidelines. The language in the interpretation is a little tortured and is confusing. We recommend that both of these interpretations be reviewed by Michael Benitez prior to further consideration by the PSC.

- f. Interpretation of Chapter I, part C, section 3, and Chapter 1, part D, section 2.3, and Chapter I, part D, section 4. Professional ethics of faculty and relationships of a consensual Sexual Nature (pages 42-43)

In the University's Code of Conduct, conflict of interest is defined in one way and in the Staff Conflict of Interest Policy it is defined in a different way. HR should be alerted that there is inconsistency across documents; Kris will do this in the interest of informing PSC's consideration of alignment of the Faculty Code. Lines 38 and 39 on p 43 need to be changed because these reference the wrong section of the Code. Line 15 needs to be revised for sake of accuracy. Tiffany will craft new language.

Adjourned at 10:21.