

Faculty Senate Minutes
March 10, 2003, 4:00 P.M.

Senators present: J. **Edgoose**, H. **Haltom**, D. **Tinsley**, A. **Tullis**, J. **McGruder**, J. **Hanson**, K. **Porter**, C. **Kline**, K. **Hummel-Berry**, H. **Ostrom**, T. **Cooney**, C. **Sanders**, R. **Wilson**

The minutes of February 24 were accepted as corrected.

Special Order:

Ostrom noted that Senator Anton was on sabbatical leave and asked for guidance from the Senators as to whether to appoint a replacement for the remaining 6 Senate meetings for the year. Receiving none, we will have to wait to see what he does.

Ostrom announced he had sent the Resolution On Educational Benefits document (supporting the extension of educational benefits to the same- sex domestic partners) document to Weyerhaeuser, Oppenheimer and Thomas.

Hanson and **Hummel-Berry** reported that they met with Karen Goldstein to discuss the four new written policies on confidentiality. Goldstein indicated that outside financial auditors pointed out that financial information was not adequately protected. This led the President's Cabinet to review and rewrite related policies. She indicated that she had no problem with the Senate suggesting revisions.

Senator Curt **Sanders** notified the Senate that today was his last day as a Senator. The new ASB President, Frost, will be making a new appointment. **Sanders** thanked the Senate on behalf of himself and outgoing ASB president, Ben Shelton for the opportunity to participate. **Ostrom** thanked **Sanders** for his conscientious execution of duties and for his stimulating conversation and promoting a healthy revival of the elections by running for ASB President.

McGruder announced that since the last road grating between the pool and South Hall, water has been soaking into the floor and support beams at the southwest corner of the building. Mold is growing on equipment in storage and this mold is being tested for toxicity.

Old Business:

Discussion of the Weapons Policy-

Tinsley stated that the goal of the policy was admirable, weapons have no place on campus, but the policy as now written is troubling. The edict that faculty should inform on faculty sets up an ugly scene and the search policy seems to have no limit. This could include strip searches and cavity searches and thus needs to be specified in the document. The policy does not define weapons. The current policy as written has no place in our society. He recommended that the policy be modified to move away from these features.

Haltom objected to the clause that states persons or their property will not be searched without their consent yet, the document states "the individual's consent...is required as a condition of enrollment or employment and refusal to consent will result in ... expulsion or termination of employment...". **Haltom** said such a clause is a threat to liberty, and at best disingenuous. He believes that the Weapons Policy is an overreaction to an incident.

Kline asked whether Senators thought that there should be no policy? She thought that the new policy was a consolidation of existing policy and asked, "What do we think is a valid concern, important enough to put limits on our society?"

Tinsley supposed that the document was likely passed by the University's lawyers. But he questioned why not just call the police if there was an incident on campus and let them handle it? He asked whether it was worth giving three people on campus the power to invade our intimate privacy and turning the campus into East Germany.

McGruder asked if it was worth trading trust in exchange for an illusion of security.

Edgoose didn't see the policy as being extreme. The dynamics of relationships that emerge in an educational setting could turn bloody. He pointed out that our situation was not that different from high school and middle schools. He supported the policy.

Tinsley disagreed with **Edgoose**. He thought that if the faculty needed to become more aware of danger, this policy would not lead to debate. He agreed that we need a policy but he warned that protecting us from threats to our safety might lead to oppression.

Kline noted that weapons are prevalent in our society and that we need a policy that outlines our rights when we find ourselves in "immediate or imminent danger".

McGruder asked where she could find copies of the previous policy documents.

Cooney indicated that Residential Life would contain the student policies and the personnel manual the policies concerning faculty and staff.

Tullis thought it more important for us to hold conversations on what we want the documents to contain.

Haltom agreed that conversation was important but that the policy was handed to us as a proclamation. We were told the policy already existed and that it was not substantially different. It would be prudent to look at the original policy and compare to the new document. He noted that previously the UPS policies covering Drugs in the Workplace and Early Retirement had more stringent restrictions than those imposed by the federal government. He noted that it is possible to use the overhaul of a policy to rationalize and expand the reach of the policy.

Cooney noted that the contradiction for the early retirement existed with in the federal government and that we were in legal jeopardy until the Congress passed a law.

McGruder noted that the term "resume work after retirement" was narrowly defined and she worried about the faculty losing the power to define terms.

Tinsley noted that the privacy policy does not apply to firearms only but states:

"In case of suspected possession of illegal or unauthorized drugs, alcoholic beverages, firearms, weapons, or stolen property, the University reserves the right to search personal belongings on University property, including but not limited to articles of clothing, purses, briefcases, bags and vehicles."

Tinsley conceded that the danger of firearms may warrant some type of policy but questioned whether all of these conditions warranted this extreme action.

Kline agreed a drug search would not place one in imminent danger" but we do need to define what situations would warrant which response.

Hummel-Berry said she thought that it was a basic human right to call security or the police when we are threatened and wondered do we now need a policy to call the police?

Kline, who pulls from her dealings with public schools, noted that we need appropriate legal authority to grab a student or do what is needed to make a place safe. She reiterated the point that we need a broad-based conversation with the faculty.

Hans noted that the policy does not address the authority.....
End of minutes by Wilson...go Karen!

Senate notes

Ostrom asked if the policy should be rewritten as the others are. **Hanson** supported the idea. **Kline** urged clarification of the problem and definition of the questions. For example, what are the concerns about civil and free environments? What are the legitimate lines of authority?

Porter pointed out that “weapons” as defined in the current policy can include a range of pedagogical tools such as cultural artifacts and urged a careful consideration of pedagogical issues as definitions are explored. **Tullis** agreed.

Tullis queried the need for a policy. What can we do and what can't we do by this Policy? As citizens, what are our rights?

Cooney emphasized that it is within employers' rights to ban weapons in the workplace and that citizens' legal rights and rights in an employment situation are not the same.

Haltom pointed out that the current policy doesn't address issues or protocols for situations of imminent danger. **Ostrom** suggested discussing the issue with the entire faculty.

Tinsley noted that searches and privacy matters were major concerns and that the privacy policy converged with the firearms policy in this regard. Rewriting the policies would give the faculty a text to discuss. **Haltom** urged elimination of the phrase “no one will be searched without consent...”

Sanders pointed out that students give up many rights when they come to school and asked how students could be educated about their rights. **Ostrom** commented that the policy was strict in some respects but didn't outline faculty rights or authority to deal with students. **Haltom** noted that when he teaches the Logger and discusses with students the rights and civil liberties they give up by attending a private school they are invariably surprised.

McGruder asked that work be done to research and discuss the origins of the policy as efforts are made to rewrite it. **Hummel-Berry** urged that we don't follow primary school model too closely as we consider rewriting the policy.

Ostrom moved to the class schedule issue. **Hanson** circulated a copy of a color-coded class time schedule prepared by Prof. Beezer. **Hanson** pointed out that Chemistry, Mathematics and other departments faced troubling issues with the new schedule. The difficulties raise the fundamental question of whether it is efficiency or pedagogy that drives the creation of a particular class schedule. **Hanson** argued that pedagogy should drive decision-making and that the existing schedule causes less effective teaching.

He asked if it were possible to go back to 4 day classes (MTTF) instead of MTWF, pointing out that the latter schedule is too onerous in terms of amount of material covered for students and faculty, and that the problems were significant and detrimental.

Cooney commented that the arguments are always made in terms of pedagogy – but it needs to be shown how a particular arrangement is pedagogically sound. The new schedule is meant to achieve efficiency and enable UPS to add faculty members over the next decade without adding new buildings. The campus is currently pressed by available classrooms and that Tuesday/Thursday 2 hour time blocks are not effective or convincing. Rooms are vacant for 1/2 hour of every 2 hr. block. By adjusting the schedule the university picked up prime time hour. He added that the new science building poses challenges and space will be lost until the new construction is completed. Restructuring of 4 day week would make marginal gains but phasing plans were needed first.

Edgoose noted that the vast majority of 2 hour classes are on TT; more MW classes could be scheduled, which would decrease the need to free up TT classes. Imbalance would even out. **Cooney** pointed out that many core courses were concentrated on a MWF schedule in the middle of the day. Upper division courses tended to be on TT and the number of conflicts went up. Increasing the options over which classes are offered reduces the conflict. One can propose to use 2 periods (i.e., labs, studio art). Could justify schedule with the curriculum committee.

McGruder said that OT/PT uses this solution but its efficacy would be undermined if it were widely adopted. **Cooney** declared that it was too late to address this for fall semester 2003; it could be considered in the spring but more information was needed on the phased plan for the science building and what the pressures would be. **Tullis** noted that pedagogical arguments for 4 day schedule are strong enough and that it can be made to work.

Haltom pointed out that it wouldn't suffice if the full faculty met on this because a safe prediction would be that they like the old schedule. A presentation could be organized to present what are the difficulties. Unaffected faculty might be affected by presentation but would need to hear the arguments. **Ostrom** supported this noting that schedule changes had caused no ripple in Wyatt except in the department of Foreign Languages and Literature; the ripple effect would be in Thompson Hall (sciences).

Tinsley concurred, saying that while teaching under the new schedule is less efficient; he can live with it if reductions in conflicts and an increase in efficiency are apparent. He did note that he sees more conflicts under new schedule with advisees than under the previous schedule.

Ostrom summarized the sense of senate – to go back to MTTF, 4 day/week schedule pending discussion with planners in June. There should be a full faculty meeting on this.

Meeting adjourned (Time was not noted).

Respectfully submitted,

Roberta Wilson & Karen Porter
Secretaries for the Day