Faculty Senate Minutes
05/03/04 Meeting

Senators present: Barry Anton, Kris Bartanen, Bill Beardsley (Chair), Terry Cooney, Alyce
DeMarais, Julian Edgoose, Robin Foster, Bill Haltom, Suzanne Holland, Paul Loeb, Keith
Maxwell, Karen Porter, David Tinsley

Visitors: Bill Breitenbach, Wade Hands, Duane Hulbert, Betsy Kirkpatrick, David Macey, Sue
Owen, Tom Rowland, Kate Stirling, Carolyn Weisz

At 4:05 PM, Beardsley called the meeting to order.

Beardsley announced that the "missing policies" (on privacy, weapons, etc. - see April 19, 2004
Senate meeting minutes) have been found. Beardsley will draft a letter to the faculty regarding
the policies and the existing policies posted online will be updated to reflect the revised versions.

M/S/P Approval of the April 19, 2004 minutes.

Beardsley then announced a time revision for the May 10, 2004 Senate meeting: the meeting will
be held at 2:30 PM.

Committee Reports
1. Diversity Committee

    David Macey, Diversity Committee Chair, presented the year-end report of the Diversity
    Committee (DC).

    Maxwell asked if specific programs were suggested for Proposed Charge #3 (for the 2004-05
    DC). Macey responded with two suggestions: 1) develop a university diversity statement,
    tailored to different audiences, and 2) develop curriculum about discrimination and
    harassment in light of the new policy.

    Anton asked if the DC collaborated with Student Life and other committees on campus.
    Macey replied that some collaboration has occurred but there could be more. Macey thought
    it fortunate that one of the DC student members was also a member of the Student Life
    Committee. In addition, the DC met in the Student Diversity Center which encouraged
    student participation, energy and insight. Anton suggested that a liaison from the Student
    Life Committee attend DC meetings.

    Anton then asked how theme year programming corresponded with DC goals. Macey
    outlined that the theme year: 1) promoted awareness of diversity, 2) brought leaders in areas
    of diversity-related issues to campus, and 3) created a sense of community - a "coalitional
    nexus" - through the process of developing theme year programming.

    Tinsley wondered how the committee envisioned the proposed "Response Team" (Proposed
    Charge #6) would operate. Macey said that DC members are often approached by campus
    community members in response to diversity related events and issues that occur on campus
    and serve as facilitators of conversations about these events. It is difficult to organize

discussions, usually on short notice, that do not inflame the issue. Macey proposes formal training for members of the Response Team so they can efficiently promote the educational work of the DC in these instances. Bartanen mentioned that the DC drafted a protocol for how to analyze and respond to incidents. The protocol will facilitate a quick response to volatile situations that may arise around issues of diversity. Rather than "scrambling" in response to an incident, the Response Team will be prepared, with protocol in hand, to act as mediators in these situations.

Cooney noted that times have changed in regard to the activities of the Diversity Committee; a few years ago it seemed that the committee did not have much to do.

Senators **M/S/P** to receive the Diversity Committee's 2003-04 Annual Report.

2. Student Life Committee

    Duane Hulbert (Chair) presented the annual report of the Student Life Committee (SLC). After outlining the committee's work, Hulbert mentioned that the work load was "not tremendous" (he estimated the committee met about 10 times over the academic year) but should continue. Hulbert ended his presentation by adding a student-generated charge of assessing parking on campus.

    Holland raised a concern about campus-wide communication, particularly in regards to event scheduling. She observed that the current form of the master calendar does not seem to work well for coordinating event scheduling and much of the publicity for events seems to be "last minute". Cooney mentioned that many things are included on the master calendar and wondered how to draw attention to the calendar. Bartanen reported that, with the new calendar, anyone can enter in their events online. She also mentioned that one can use the sort function on the calendar to view events. Eventually, the university will install a "portal" so event announcements will arrive on one's computer desktop, but this feature is currently not available.

    Senators **M/S/P** to receive the Student Life Committee's 2003-04 Annual Report.

3. Academic Standards Committee

    Betsy Kirkpatrick (Chair) presented the annual report of the Academic Standard Committee (ASC). Beardsley noted that the report did not contain any proposed charges. Kirkpatrick responded that the ASC would welcome any charges from the Senate.

    Foster noted that, since the Ombudsperson (proposed to assist faculty members with instances of student academic dishonesty) had been rescinded, the new language involved departmental chairs/program directors to a greater extent. Foster asked if department chairs had been notified of this change. Kirkpatrick responded that chairs had not been notified, but their role has always been assumed. Foster recommended department chairs/program directors be informed of the policy and language changes.

Beardsley noted, regarding the Robert Trimble Distinguished Asia Scholars recognition, that departments were limited to 10% of their graduating class for departmental honors yet every Interdisciplinary Emphasis in Asia Studies student could potentially be a Distinguished Asia Scholar. Kirkpatrick affirmed this and added that the ASC required several submissions of the proposal to increase the standards. Cooney remarked that the GPA required for university honors was 3.7 and above. Kirkpatrick mentioned that some, the Curriculum Committee for example, thought the 3.5 GPA in Asian Studies courses stipulation for Distinguished Asia Scholar was too high. **Foster suggested the Senate evaluate how many students receive the Distinguished Asia Scholar title.** Holland noted that the criteria, as presented, were weak.

Senators **M/S/P** to receive the Academic Standards Committee's 2003-04 Annual Report.

4. Professional Standards Committee (PSC)

Kate Stirling (Chair) presented the PSC annual report. She first thanked the committee members and mentioned that it was a difficult year for the PSC. She noted that the PSC members were deliberate and thoughtful in everything they did and let the Code guide their decisions. Stirling also noted that every PSC decision was unanimous. Most of the work of the PCS this year revolved around changes in the Code.

Maxwell opened the discussion by asking if any of the hearing boards were the intermediate hearings outlined in the Code. Stirling affirmed that two of the hearings were intermediate.

Stirling noted that the PSC will continue its discussion of the term "working days" at its May 7, 2004 meeting (Section 7 of the PSC Annual Report). If the issue of "working days" is not resolved at this meeting, it would become a proposed charge for next year's committee. An additional charge is "housecleaning" of the Code.

Holland inquired what "working days" entailed. Stirling replied that several terms are used throughout the Code (working days, business days, etc.) and their use should be checked for consistency. She also noted that the PSC should review if the number of days allotted for each task is appropriate. Holland then asked about the Code interpretation for days absent from campus; this interpretation was reported by the 2002-03 PSC.

Porter asked for clarification of Section IV - Reappointments - did it meet AAUP standards? Cooney replied that the changes to the Code (first reading at the April 7, 2004 Faculty Meeting) were designed for faculty who were not on ongoing appointments.

Haltom asked for a PSC recommendation to the Senate regarding Part G, Section 1 - Responsibility, regarding interpretation of the Code (Appendix 1). Haltom asked if the PSC does not deliver an interpretation to the Senate, does that indicate the interpretation was not of "significant merit"? Stirling responded that the term "interpretation" must be used carefully. PSC discussions were all "significant", but responses to inquiries were often

needed in a short turnaround time (sometimes less than 24 hours), that precluded a clear, thorough formal interpretation.

Haltom stated his concern that such "ancillary interpretations" of the Code - those "informal" interpretations made in response to inquiries - were not recorded or sent to the Senate. Without documentation, and given the short terms of PSC members, Haltom worried that ancillary interpretations would be lost in a form of "institutional amnesia". Cooney responded that the kind of inquires stated were not recorded in the minutes of the PSC, as the nature of the committee actions was analogous to the FAC. Cooney also noted that parts of the Code required formal interpretation. Beardsley noted that time pressure should not dictate whether a decision is rendered as a formal interpretation. Cooney responded that it is through the current process that issues requiring formal interpretation are identified. Loeb disagreed with Cooney's PSC/FAC comparison, stating that the PSC must make substantial interpretations that should be part of the minutes and, therefore, available to the faculty. Maxwell noted that PSC interpretations are "official" [mandated by the Code] while FAC interpretations are not binding.

Loeb noted that the PSC's charge to render the Code in response to inquiries raises a conflict of interest as the issue may represent a conflict between the PSC and another body. Stirling responded that the PSC tried to be "transparent" about the process of rendering the Code. Loeb reiterated that the Senate should be privy to all PSC renderings of the Code.

Hands stated that every PSC ruling involves "interpretation" - of Departmental Guidelines, of the Code, etc. Foster disagreed with this comparison, stating that Departmental Guidelines are public documents that are reviewed through open dialog. Weisz reiterated the difficulties with time constraints. She said all PSC members recognized that formal interpretations of the Code were needed; however, the short turnaround times for inquiry response often precluded such deliberations. Those formal interpretation issues that were discussed were recorded in the minutes (bearing in mind issues of confidentiality). Beardsley noted that, historically, PSC reports are usually "empty" due to confidentiality.

Haltom then noted that, since formal interpretations of the Code are carried out by a Faculty Senate committee (the PSC), the Senate should be able to review what interpretations were made. Cooney pointed out that the Senate could not overrule Code interpretations, particularly if those interpretations were made in response to a hearing board which requires secrecy. Cooney reminded the Senate that faculty involved with hearing boards were obligated to maintain secrecy. Cooney also noted that the Senate could ask for formal interpretation of the Code that would lead to public discussion and interpretation. Stirling reiterated that the PSC found several parts of the Code that needed discussion and formal interpretation. Beardsley questioned what mechanism could be used if an issue was raised by a hearing board - how would it be raised for interpretation by the PSC?

Finally, two issues were raised by Haltom: the PSC's criticism of the tone of a departmental guideline, and alleged remarks directed towards faculty members by the PSC. Owen noted that tone was a part of rhetoric. Stirling denied that the PSC directed inappropriate remarks

toward a faculty member, although the PSC had heard of said remarks. Holland noted that the discussion had moved away from Code interpretation issues.

Loeb requested that a charge be given to the 2004-05 PSC to undertake formal interpretation of the Code.

Senators **M/S/P** with 9 in favor, 1 opposed, and 2 abstentions to receive the Professional Standards Committee 2003-04 Final Report.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:40 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Alyce DeMarais

Appendix 1 – Excerpt from the Faculty Code

PART G - INTERPRETATION OF THE FACULTY CODE

Section 1 - Responsibility

It shall be the duty of the Professional Standards Committee to issue interpretations of the faculty code. Any member or members of the academic community may request an interpretation of the faculty code, and/or the Professional Standards Committee may initiate the interpretation. If the Professional Standards Committee deems an interpretation to be of significant merit it shall issue a formal written interpretation which shall be delivered to the Faculty Senate for inclusion within the Senate minutes. Such interpretations shall also be forwarded to the Academic and Student Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees for its concurrence. If there is a disagreement, the two committees, or their representatives, shall meet to formulate a unified interpretation. If they cannot agree, the matter shall be submitted for binding arbitration under the rules of the American Arbitration Association.