Call to order

Approval of the minutes of December 1, 2011 meeting

Report of the Executive Committee

Honor System discussion—Senators Vanessa Beasley and Joy Calico, co-chairs, Student Life committee and Past Vice Chair Bobby Bodenheimer

Request for change in non-discrimination policy language—Provost Richard McCarty

Changes to committee descriptions in Senate Rules of Order—Senator Agnes Fogo, Senate Affairs committee

New business

Good of the Senate

Adjournment

Voting Members present: Andrews, Aurbach, Barth, Barz, Beasley, Brady, Braxton, Calico, Cannon, Carlton, Clark, Conway-Welch, Dawant, Dever, Does, Donaldson, Fogo, Gigante, Gokhale, Hughes, Hyman, Johnston, March, Miller, Moore, Morrill, Nanney, Niswender, Ramey, Rogers, Schwartz, Skaar, Tellinghuisen, Tsinakis, Weintraub, Wikswo, Winder, Wollaeger, Yarbrough, Yoder, and Zamora.

Voting Members absent: Aschner (regrets), Atack (regrets), Bachorowski, Balser (regrets), Benbow, Bond (regrets), Beauchamp, Bradford, Carbone, Galloway (regrets), Guthrie, Hall (regrets), Halpern, Hudnut-Beumler (regrets), Hurder (regrets), Kirshner,
Mulavaney, Powers (regrets), Ramanujam (regrets), Tansey, Turner, Van Kaer (regrets), Wait (regrets), and Wayman.

Ex Officio Members present: Bandas, Bodenheimer, Fife, Fortune, Kovalcheck, McCarty, McNamara, Raiford, Sweet, Wcislo, Williams, and Zeppos.

Ex Officio Members absent: Bernard (regrets), Christman (regrets), Miller, Stalcup, Wente (regrets), and Wright.

The meeting was called to order at 4:10 p.m. by Chair David Weintraub.

Next Item on the Agenda – Approval of the minutes of December 1, 2011 meeting

Chair Weintraub asked for these minutes to be approved. Motion to approve passed unanimously.

Next Item on the Agenda – Report of the Executive Committee

Chair Weintraub gave the report of the Executive Committee:

- Regular monthly meetings with Chancellor, with Provost/VCHA, with Senate Committee Chairs
- Planning for Senate Office space during/after Alumni Hall remodel
- Planning for Abby Stewart (guest of Senate) visit in April
- Consultative Committee met (nominees for awards, university standing committees)
- Smoke Free Campus: end of cigarette sales in Munchie Marts, 2012
- On-line implementation of Faculty Manual

Next Item on the Agenda – Honor System discussion—Senators Vanessa Beasley and Joy Calico, co-chairs, Student Life committee and Past Vice Chair Bobby Bodenheimer

Chair Weintraub then turned the floor over to Senators Vanessa Beasley, Joy Calico and Past Vice Chair Bobby Bodenheimer who gave their presentation from the Student Life committee on the Honor System report. They first gave a history of the charge. They listed questions that they asked about the Honor System. They said that the purpose of today’s meeting is to promote an open discussion of the Honor System, and we are also focused on the implementation of the report (how will the recommendations be carried out? Who is responsible for each one?), and the assessment of the outcome of the report (How will we know things are better?). They reviewed the nomenclature concerning the Honor System, and they went over their methods. The recommendations fall into three areas: 1) information: raising awareness of the Honor System, 2) engagement: addressing faculty concerns, 3) process improvements: fixes and tweaks. They also mentioned opportunities for engagement for faculty members (task forces, committees).
Then, they opened the floor for discussion and comments.

Question: Why there are separate task forces?
Senator Beasley: We tried to be thoughtful regarding the stakeholders in these different issues, and we saw a separation between programmatic issues and faculty autonomy issues, for example.
Past Vice Chair Bodenheimer: We are open to the criticism that we “kicked the can down the road,” but we didn’t want to be prescriptive about the solutions without input from the students.

Senator Beasley: You will have more time to look at this report, and there will be a vote at the March meeting to accept the report. There will be a second vote to make this report public, also at the March meeting.

Provost McCarty: You have done a great service to the Faculty Senate and the university. You have tackled a very tough issue with compassion and thoughtfulness. The role that the Senate plays in this cannot be understated. We need the support and active involvement of faculty. If we don’t get this, we will have an honor system in name only. We have to try to get to a point where we have a clean slate and start to have a system that we can be proud of. You have provided a wonderful roadmap for us to follow. I promise you that I and my colleagues in the Provost’s office will work on this carefully and collaboratively with the Senate.

Chair Weintraub: The Senate does expect the various tasked people to follow up on these recommendations.
Past Vice Chair Bodenheimer: The Senate is also tasked with following up on these recommendations in two years.

Question: If faculty are not using the honor system and part of it has to do with believing that they have little say in the outcome, then how is this going to encourage the faculty to use the honor system?

Professor Charlie Brau: The faculty do have voting rights in some cases. So, we have broken through that barrier in some small ways.

Question: So is my assumption wrong?
Senator Beasley: There are multiple assumptions and multiple answers to this. There are ways for the faculty to be involved (i.e. faculty observer role). But there is also difficulty in finding faculty to fulfill these roles. We would like to echo the clean slate approach that the Provost mentioned.

Chair Weintraub: What we’re asking is to negotiate the level that the faculty is involved since they are already involved in it to some degree.

Provost McCarty: There are also other levels of faculty involvement—such as closing the loop for communication with faculty who participate in the honor council and also having
the undergraduate honor council report to the Associate Provost. I think this is a better way to go, in my mind.

Question: Is there an inequality to the degree that the faculty has access to the Honor System versus the student’s access to the Honor System? For example, the way a faculty member can’t provide a rebuttal.

Past Vice Chair Bodenheimer: Outside of the law school, the system is designed to be non-adversarial. What happens is that a faculty member presents their evidence and then the student can respond. Then the council makes their decision.

Comment: Instead of “rebuttal,” I should have used a less adversarial word.

Question: Can you speak to issues about Appellate Review Board and lack of communication with faculty members.

Senator Beasley: In recommendation #1, we said that we need guidance for faculty going through this process as well as the students (who already have guidance/advisors during this process).

Provost McCarty: I think that this is one of the shortcomings that they have addressed in this report.

Question: Who would implement the database for faculty reporting violations that don’t go to the Honor Council? I think that’s a great idea and will get more faculty members involved.

Past Vice Chair Bodenheimer: The Provost is responsible for that. Coming up with some best practices for that will be very helpful.

Chair Weintraub thanked all of them for their hard work.

Next Item on the Agenda – Request for change in non-discrimination policy language—Provost Richard McCarty

Chair Weintraub turned the floor over to Provost Richard McCarty who is asking the Senate to approve a change in the Faculty Manual. This change will be voted on at the next Senate meeting in March.

Provost McCarty gave a presentation on the issue of changing the Faculty Manual to reflect the correct version of the nondiscrimination policy. He said that this is necessary to have all the university documents match (Student Handbook, Faculty Manual, and Human Resources policy).

Chancellor Zeppos: It is clear that there is confusion about this policy the way that it’s written in the Faculty Manual. I feel strongly about the principle of nondiscrimination.
Q: Question about fraternities and sororities discriminating?
Chancellor Zeppos: There is a statutory exception that deals with the Greek system.

Chair Weintraub said that he is forming an ad hoc committee to discuss the proposed change so that we can hear from all faculty voices. The committee will be chaired by Chair-elect Sal March. Chair Weintraub thanked Provost McCarty for his presentation.

Next Item on the Agenda – Changes to committee descriptions in Senate Rules of Order—Senator Agnes Fogo, Senate Affairs committee

Chair Weintraub turned the floor over to Senator Agnes Fogo, chair of the Senate Affairs committee. Senator Fogo gave the background for this motion to change the committee descriptions in the Senate Rules of Order. She then asked for any questions.

Question: Which staff councils would be contacted by Senate Affairs on a yearly basis?
Senator Fogo: We are thinking of the University Staff Council, but we are willing to meet with other staff councils if they want to reach out to us.

Hearing no other questions, Chair Weintraub thanked her for her presentation and reminded everyone that the vote on this change would take place at the next Senate meeting in March.

Next Item on the Agenda – New business and Good of the Senate

Chair Weintraub asked for any new business or information for the good of the senate. Hearing no other business, he asked for a motion to adjourn, which was received and seconded.

Next Item on the Agenda – Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 5:25pm.