

Professional Concerns Committee Meeting Minutes for November 15, 2018 SC 109, 3:15 pm

Members in Attendance: Kalyani Ankem, Tom Bowers, John Farrar, Jane Hammons, Christopher (Collin) Herb, Kevin Munte, Jaesook Gilbert (Teacher Ed Rep), Michael Washington, Maggie Whitson, Jackie Wroughton

Members Not in Attendance: Shannon Alexander, Judy Audas, John Clarkin, Linda Dynan, Kathleen Fuegen, Nicole Grant, Jim Kirtley, Alexis Miller, Ban Mittal, Gary Newell, Blas Puente-Baldoceda, Mauricio Torres, Tammie Sherry, Tracy Songer

Guests: Janel Bloch (for the English Dept.)

1. Call to Order, Adoption of the Agenda

Due to the icy weather, many members could not attend. We waited as long as possible and then began the meeting without a quorum at 3:24 pm.

2. Approval of the Minutes from the November 1, 2018 PCC meeting.

Because there was not a quorum, we could not vote on any items, and so skipped approving the minutes.

1. Chair's Report and Announcements Chair's Report and Announcements

- a. Faculty Senate meeting, November 19, 2018
 - i. Library funding resolution voting item.
Normally, the faculty senate introduces voting items at one meeting, and then to give members time to consider them carefully, does not vote on them until the next meeting. Since the library resolution is straightforward and not controversial, they may well just vote on it on the 19th.
 - ii. Consensual relations policy for discussion in December, vote in January.
J. Farrar met with the Executive Committee and presented the PCC's draft consensual relations policy. They made several requests for clarifying language, so he updated our draft in response. We can't vote on anything today, but he'd still like feedback on the changes he made, as he'd like to be able to send our finished policy on to Faculty Senate for their vote as soon as possible. It would be nice if they had our final policy to discuss at their December meeting and could then vote on it in January.
2. Old Business, Discussion Item, Consensual Relations policy modifications (1 attachment)

A. Section 16.10. The Executive Committee wanted the nepotism section set aside as its own policy. This was uncontroversial.

B. Section 16.9.3. There had been concern expressed about the use of dating apps by faculty which might increase the probability of them contacting students or be used as a way to get around certain aspects of the consensual relations policy. In trying to address the use of dating apps, John had added the sentence "Efforts by faculty to initiate relationships with students, by whatever method, including dating apps, are prohibited." However, that then raised the question-- have we gone back to a policy that entirely forbids faculty from dating students? We had decided earlier that completely forbidding any instance of dating students would not stop it from ever happening but would mean that the school would have no ability to try to mitigate any problems associated with it, since faculty involved in such relationships would hide their involvement. We couldn't decide how best to modify the sentence, so the suggestion was to remove it and let Faculty Senate suggest changes if they felt they were necessary.

C. 16.9.2. John added some clarifying language on what kinds of change in status might cause pre-existing relationships (like marriage & spouse taking a class) to come under the consensual relationships policy. This was uncontroversial.

D. 16.9.5 This section ends with saying relationships that cause a conflict of interest which cannot be mitigated may be required to be ended. There had been questions on how this could be enforced, so John added language on then classifying ongoing relationships of this type as violations of the policy and that faculty members involved in them would be subject to the appropriate disciplinary actions (detailed in 16.9.7). This was uncontroversial.

E. 19.9.5 This section explains that while faculty involved in relationships that fall under the consensual relationships policy must report these, the policy is not meant to dictate that faculty who know about colleagues involved in such relationships must report them. However, there are some legal requirements associated with reporting certain types of Title IX and ethics policy violations, so clarifying language was added to explain that people did still have to follow those policies. That was uncontroversial.

3. Old Business, Discussion Item, Tenure statement (1 attachment)

Feedback was given on the revised draft tenure statement that J. Farrar has been working on. He had made changes based on feedback given in previous PCC meetings.

A. There had been questions about whether the 1940 statement on tenure needed to be cited so heavily, since that reinforces the perception that tenure is an old-fashioned, outdated concept. John looked into that, but the 1940 statement seems to be the standard used, so it was hard to remove mention of that.

B. Suggestions were made for improving the flow of the statement, including streamlining or cutting down on the number of direct quotes so that the reader wasn't constantly having to follow switches between the writer's point of view and statements from previous works. However, it was noted that the quotes did serve to document that NKU faculty are not the only people making arguments in favor of tenure.

It was also suggested that mention of the Kentucky bill eliminating tenure protections be mentioned earlier in the document so that it was more immediately obvious why we felt the need to make arguments in favor of tenure.

C. Common misperceptions about or arguments against tenure were mentioned early in the document, but the Kentucky bill focused on financial exigency as the main reason for eliminating tenure. It was suggested that it might be better for us to focus on countering the bill's arguments rather than mentioning general arguments against tenure.

4. UPDATE FROM KALYANI ANKEM ON ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION WORKING GROUP.

K. Ankem has formed a working group with John Bickers (Chase Law) and Kathleen Fuegen to consider evaluation procedures for administrators. Anyone who'd like to join this working group should contact K. Ankem. The group will focus on: 1) What should be done with the evaluations? Make them public or give them to the administration to be used as part of their performance evaluation process? 2) Which administrators should be evaluated and who should evaluate them? 3) What should the evaluation process be?

The background on this is as follows: The president of Faculty Senate used to gather up the evaluation results and then send them to the administrators so they could take that feedback into account. A few years ago, a newspaper reported requested these evaluations under the public records act, and this information ended up being publicly published. Since then, the evaluations have gone into limbo because it hasn't been clear what should be done with them. As far as we know, legally, feedback used in employee performance evaluations does not fall under the public records law, and records like this that are made public than cannot be used in performance evaluations. So the big question now is how do we want this feedback to be used? Should it be made public or kept confidential?

M. Washington suggested we might be able to do both. Further discussion of this led to the suggestion that perhaps the evaluation survey could perhaps request general feedback that could be made public, but also have more targeted questions about specific administrators that could be kept confidential and used in their performance evaluations.

5. The meeting was adjourned at 4:53 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Maggie Whitson, standing in for Tracy Songer, PCC Secretary