Members present: Redican, Ball, Eriksson, Hagen, Sanders, Kelly, Robinson, Stephens, O’Keefe, Hyer, Welch
Guest: Bernice Hausman, Associate Professor, Department of English and chair of the Committee on Faculty Ethics

Redican called the meeting to order with six items on the agenda: 1) Update on Modified Duties Policy and Stop the Clock, 2) Faculty Ethics, 3) Discussions and approval of revisions of sections 1.5.1 and 2.13.1 of the Faculty Handbook, 4) Continuation of discussion of proposed revision to 2.8.4.2, 5) Commission on Equal Opportunity and Diversity Resolution 2005-06A, Reporting Diversity-Related Activities on Faculty Activities Reports, and 6) University Libraries CFA Membership Request. Minutes from the previous meeting were approved.

Update on Modified Duties Policy and Stop the Clock Provisions

President Steger has suggested several modifications to the policies. The Stop the Clock policy currently states that a faculty member will notify administration if they are enacting the Stop the Clock provision for childbirth. President Steger has asked that ‘notify’ be changed to request. In addition, review by legal counsel has highlighted the need to require medical documentation for requests based on medical reasons. Language was added to the policy to clarify how stopping the clock affects probationary reviews. CFA members agreed to the changes.

Faculty Ethics

Bernice Hausman, chair of the Committee on Faculty Ethics (CFE) explained proposed changes for sections 1.5.3 (describing the Committee on Faculty Ethics) and 2.7 (Professional Responsibility and Conduct) of the Faculty Handbook. Additional language has been added to section 1.5.3 to address conflicts of interest that involve faculty members who serve on CFE and language has been revised to address confidentiality of communications. Section 2.7 has been reorganized so that the scholarly misconduct policy is clearly identified as a type of unethical behavior and the policy comes immediately after the “Statement of Principles of Ethical Behavior,” to emphasize this point.

In addition, revisions to the scholarly misconduct policy clarifies the role that the CFE plays in the process. The CFE chair receive reports and appoints a nonvoting participant to panels of inquiry to facilitate communication between different groups investigating an accusation. CFA members agreed in principle with revisions with the exception of language that has been added to address security of electronic communications. CFA members suggested leaving the policy as it is currently written as it seems to create an
efficient process that is already confidential and proposed changes would create unnecessary confusion.

Hyer and other members of the commission will review the proposed changes and follow up with Hausman if there are substantive concerns. Hausman will present the changes to university legal counsel for review and circulate any suggested changes among CFA members for additional comment before voting on revisions during the March 31st CFA meeting.

Draft of proposed revision to 2.8.4.2

CFA members reviewed revisions that have been made to 1.51. and 2.13.1 regarding promotion and tenure committee composition and the promotion and tenure process. A flowchart that reflects the current and proposed processes was circulated for comment. CFA members agreed the flowchart was helpful and made changes that would clarify the process further. Revisions to the policy include directing appeals based on procedural violations to the Faculty Grievance Committee and removing the option to create an ad hoc committee at either the college or university level should procedural issues have tainted the process. At the final stage, in cases where the university-level committee supports the recommendation for tenure and the Provost denies it, the appeal would go directly to the President rather than going through the Faculty Review Committee first.

CFA members also reviewed the changes outlined for promotion and tenure committee composition that limits the role of the department head on department and college-level review committees. Following a motion to vote on the suggested revisions with editorial changes, CFA members voted and unanimously approved the changes. The resolution will be sent to University Council for first reading.

Discussions and Approval of 1.5.1 and 2.13.1

Eriksson presented and explained the changes that have been made to 1.5.1 and 2.13.1 to clarify the role of the Committee on Reconciliation including a revision of the list of valid issues for grievance. Editorial changes were suggested to maintain clarity and consistency across policies. CFA members voted unanimously to approve the changes with the additional editorial corrections. The resolutions will be sent to University Council for first reading.

Commission on Equal Opportunity and Diversity Resolution 2005-06A, Reporting Diversity-Related Activities on Faculty Activity Reports

Hyer explained that the Commission on Equal Opportunity and Diversity (CEOD) has approved a resolution to address the reporting of diversity activities on Faculty Activity Reports (FARs). The CEOD felt that it is important to have all colleges require the reporting of diversity-related accomplishments on FARs as diversity is a university priority. The CEOD suggested it would also be helpful to work with several groups on campus to provide examples and resources of specific activities that could be included on
FARs that would fulfill this reporting area. CFA members agreed that the educational piece was an important component and would ensure appropriate information is included when faculty do their reports. Including this on FARs could also create opportunities for conversations between faculty and administration. Following a motion to vote, CFA members voted unanimously to endorse the resolution.

**Designated Slot for Library Faculty Representative on CFA**

Redican shared a request from the library faculty association chair asking that a representative from the university libraries be included on CFA. Following discussion of the request, CFA members determined it would not be appropriate to designate a slot for a library representative. CFA membership is derived from the Faculty Senate as a whole, and slots are not allocated by colleges. The library faculty association is represented on Faculty Senate and their representative is free to volunteer to serve on CFA if interested. Kerry will encourage the Library Faculty Association to pursue this route to membership on CFA if that is a priority. Librarians have served as members and chairs of CFA in years past.

*Recorder,*
*Catherine Amelink*