

Faculty Senate Minutes November 21, 2005

Senators: Barry Anton, Kris Bartanen, Nancy Bristow, Derek Buescher, Bill Haltom, Suzanne Holland, John Hanson, Alex Israel, Jean Kim, John Lear, Eric Orlin, Ross Singleton, David Sousa, and Peter Wimberger, Barbara Racine, Chelsea Howes, Juli McGruder.

Guests: William Breitenbach, Lipika Chovdhury, Alice Demarais, Karl Fields, John Finney, Jaime Lippy, Juli McGruder, Jannie Meisberger, and Carolyn Weisz.

Order

Senate Chair Anton called the meeting to order at 4:30 p.m.

Minutes

Minutes of October 31, 2005 were approved. Minutes of the November 13, 2005 meeting were approved with the following change: Senator Haltom asked that the word plagiarism be used instead of academic honesty to more accurately reflect the conversation of the senate. Senator McGruder has a change to send Sen. Lear. Senator Bartanen asked about an administrative reference on page 2, which was deleted.

M/S/P minutes were approved.

Announcements

1. Senate meeting dates were handed out for next semester.
2. Ad Hoc Committee on Professional Standards: Chair is Senator Bristow and members are Senator Sousa and Senator Hanson.

Chair's Report

Scribe did not note one.

Old Business

1. Senator Haltom handed out draft changes to the Ad Hoc Committee on Professional Standards, which he named "Three Professors Overseeing" (C3PO).

Discussion ensued. (Document is attached to minutes.)

Carolyn Weisz, PSC Chair, indicates that the Code precludes PSC members (past or present) from talking about cases and wonders how successful an ad hoc committee could be. Senator Sousa said this raises interesting issues about confidentiality and whether the Code documents shield members. Does the Code protect PSC members, or the grievants?

Professor Weisz: PSC is unclear on desired outcome of the Ad Hoc Committee's (AHC) work, and perhaps it might not need to look at specific cases to achieve its goals.

Senator Wimberger: It would be most helpful for AHC to look at the kinds of cases that stressed the Code most.

Senator Breitenbach: Protections in Code are to protect the grievants; and concerns about process are meaningless without the context of particular cases. Members of PSC feel bound by confidentiality in the Code.

Senator Bristow: We have to let the Code be at center of our deliberations. She asks, "What is public?" What does this constitute?

Senator Israel: asks for clarity on next steps; wonders if we are not skirting the issue here.

Senator Anton: notes that we are trying to clarify a change. Perhaps we need a legal ruling on what is possible.

Senator Haltom: Senate does not have prerogative to interpret the Code whereas PSC does, and this is a flaw in our process.

Professor Weisz: notes one can interpret section ___?___ in various ways. It seems to be at the heart of the Code to correct for the future, and not to go back and change past decisions about PSC oversight. We should ask what is spirit of the Code underlying this – is it to get a public disclosure of a particular case? Then we have to ask whether this is in the spirit of the Code, or not?

Senator Bristow: notes that the idea of the AHC is indeed in her opinion to look to the future and not the past.

Senator Orlin moves acceptance of the changes per committee.

M/S

Senator Haltom: prefers that the PSC relies on the letter of the Code rather than the spirit of the Code. Regarding oversight, the Senate is the appropriate body because the by-laws govern oversight. The Code is silent on oversight.

Senator McGruder: asks for clarification of the Code page 33, item 8, Public Statements. To what does the limitation refer – to statements, or to matters?

Senator Singleton: asks for clarification of the process vs. hearing in Senator Haltom's proposed change.

Senator Buescher: asks for definition of "grievances or grievance-like complaints."

Senator Bristow: wants language clarified to indicate who the participants are.

Senator Bartanen: favors clarity.

Senator Haltom on “grievance-like complaints” replies that it is to fend off technicalities about what is not a grievance.

Amendment proposed to clarify changes to indicate the Senate is not interested in retrying grievance,s but wants to look prospectively.

A/M/S/P – 3 abstentions.

Senator Buescher: Motion to insert PSC between “from” and “participants” in 4th line from bottom of the AHC charge.

Discussion.

Senator Haltom asks what one can do when one feels s/he has been screwed in the grievance process, and he is therefore opposed to this amendment.

Professor Breitenbach asks for the position of the Senate on cases in which one person is willing to come forward, but the other is not.

Senator Hanson asks if there is a distinction between seeking information from participants vs. from faculty in general. He proposes more inclusive language to reflect that anyone may talk with this committee.

Senator Orlin supports broader language so as not to get into case specifics.

Senator Haltom suggests dropping “from participants in the grievance process” in line 9.

Professor Weisz suggests that a change include some reporting mechanism.

Senator Singleton suggests the word “solicit” instead of “seek” in line 8.

Senator Buescher withdraws motion altogether.

Senator Haltom clarifies amendment and vote is taken.

M/S/P – 4 abstentions.

Discussion on whole motion as amended:

Senator Israel asked what happens when someone grieves the PSC.

Senator Anton hopes AHC will propose a process to grieve PSC if necessary, and only prospectively.

Senator Bristow wonders if we need a sentence about the intention of AHC.

Senator McGruder says people can read the minutes.

Discussion about problems with the Code on this point above.

Senator Holland calls the question.

Motion passes as amended with four abstentions.

2. New Study Abroad Categories – Ross Singleton (handouts attached to minutes)

The committee proposes new Study Abroad categories for study at UPS after meeting two and one-half years.

Senator Lear explains “old” vs. “new” categories on handout.

Senator Singleton notes that the committee recommends changing transcript categories (see page 2 on handout for rationale).

Senator Wimberger presents data from other institutions (see page 3 of handout). UPS takes the most conservative approach; the committee recommends that Senate approve the proposal to list “Partners” grades on the transcript, but not to include these in GPAs.

Associate Dean Finney clarifies that the Registrar is guided by the source of the credit: if it is from UPS, then it should get reported on the transcript; if UPS is not the source, it shouldn’t go on the transcript. Therefore, he is not in favor of this aspect of the proposal. Any consumer of student records must demand original documents, regardless of how transfer credits are listed.

Senator Singleton takes issue and says that transfer credit can be equated with UPS-sponsored study abroad credit.

Associate Dean Finney notes he is speaking from a records manager perspective: what is the source of the credit? That should be the sole criterion.

Senator Singleton says that data show that this is not a universal principle used by all colleges.

Senator McGruder asks whether questions listed on survey results are the actual questions asked of those surveyed.

Jannie Meisberger clarifies that the data only apply to what we are calling “Partner” programs.

Senator Haltom suggests that we take this up at our next meeting in two weeks, between 2-4 p.m. sometime. He gives a reminder that business displaced from this meeting concerns issues for the December 6th faculty meeting. Reminds us that faculty should not amend Faculty Code on the floor of faculty meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 5:30 pm.

Submitted by faithful, but befuddled scribe,

Senator Suzanne Holland