

Vanderbilt University
Faculty Senate Meeting
February 12, 2004
4:10 p.m. Room 140 Frist Hall, Nursing School

Call to Order

Approval of Minutes of December 11, 2003

Report of the Executive Committee
Matthew Ramsey, Chair of the Faculty Senate

Remarks by Chancellor E. Gordon Gee

Standing Committee Reports and Recommendations

Senate Affairs Committee (Beth Conklin, Chair)
Recommendation to separate the offices of Senate Parliamentarian and Chair of the Senate Affairs Committee
Note: This motion would amend the Senate's Rules of Order. Under those rules, it may not be voted on until the next meeting of the full Senate, on March 18.

Old Business:

Motion to endorse statement on diversity and freedom of expression at Vanderbilt
(Senator Michael Bess)

Report and recommendation from PEAFF (James Ely, Chair) to revise the grievance process in cases involving promotion, reappointment, and tenure.

New Business

Good of the Senate

Adjournment

Voting Members present:

Benbow, Bess, Casagrande, Conklin, Conway-Welch, Ellingham, Ely, Farran, Flake, Fleetwood, Gabbe, Goldfarb, Hawiger, Heflinger, Heyneman, Hodges, Horn, Le Boeuf, Masulis, McCarthy, McCarty, McGill, Osheroff, Paschal, Peebles, Perkins, Ramsey, Strauss, Summar, Tellinghuisen, Victor, Washington, Wcislo.

Voting Members absent: Adams, Barz (regrets), Cummings (regrets), Eigen, Fogo, Gay, Greene, Griffin, Innes (regrets), Morrow, Neff (regrets), Oates, Retzleff (regrets), Saff,

Sasson, Sevin, Smith, Swift, Thompson (regrets), Christie, Galloway, Hudnut-Beumler, Syverud (regrets), Wait (regrets).

Ex Officio Members present: Brisky, Gee, Gherman, Schoenfeld, Spruill, Williams.

Ex Officio Members absent: Balsler (regrets), Barge, Goldring (regrets) , Hall, Jacobson, Outlaw, Perfetto, Shepherd (regrets) , Spitz, Zeppos (regrets).

.....

The meeting was called to order at 4:10 p.m. by Chair Matthew Ramsey.

Minutes from 12/11/03 meeting were approved with a correction to the spelling of Sara Eigen's name. Motion passed unanimously.

Next Item on the Agenda - Report of the Executive Committee

Chair Ramsey reported on the work of the Executive Committee since the last Faculty Senate meeting. The Senate met in special Executive Session for the second time this academic year, the 15th of January. Once again, it proved to be a positive and instructive meeting. Among the many topics discussed were plans for a university governance forum, the admissions of student athletes, the role of faculty in academic appointments, student course evaluations and the possibility of faculty evaluation for administrators, and the concerns of older faculty members.

Secretary Dale Farran is hard at work preparing a summary of the meeting, which should be posted on our web site shortly. Chair Ramsey also mentioned the upcoming forum on university governance scheduled for March 25.

Chair Ramsey reported that the Executive Committee has continued to work with the Chancellor on the overhaul of the system of university committees. There will be an oversight committee for university committees including three members nominated by the Senate. Also, the Executive Committee has continued to work with the Chancellor and with Vice-Chancellor David Williams on issues related to intercollegiate athletics. There will be a new university athletics committee that will include four faculty members nominated by the Senate.

On Tuesday, Chair Ramsey reported that he and Senator Doug Perkins met with a group of student leaders and Mark Dalhouse, new Director of the Office of Volunteer Activities (now known as the Office of Active Citizenship and Service) to discuss ways of promoting civic engagement on our campus.

One concern that emerged from that discussion is the low level of faculty engagement in student volunteer activities. Ideally, student service groups should have faculty advisors,

but very few do. Chair Ramsey called for senators to give him input on how best to help the OVA with this issue.

Chair Ramsey then reminded everyone of the upcoming function with Dr. Shalala, President of the University of Miami, at noon on Tuesday, March the 3rd in the rotunda of the Wyatt Center. She will address Senators and other guests on “The Role of Academic Research in a Post-9/11 World,” and following the question and answer period, she will meet with interested senators to discuss intercollegiate athletics.

Chair Ramsey concluded his report from the Senate Executive Committee and asked for questions. Hearing none, he turned the podium over to Chancellor Gordon Gee.

Next Item on the Agenda – Remarks from Chancellor Gee

Chancellor Gee thanked Chair Ramsey for the introduction and thanked the senators for their hard work.

Chancellor Gee then stated that he wanted to focus on two issues in his remarks, the first being the oversight committee that Chair Ramsey referred to in his remarks. Chancellor Gee explained that he has been working closely with the Senate Executive Committee on an appropriate response to the Committee on Committees report. Chancellor Gee stated that the new oversight committee is almost fully appointed, and that the purpose of the committee is to have a group that can make certain that our main structure does remain viable and that it meets the challenges and opportunities that govern this university. He stated that he is very pleased with the results of that work.

The second issue concerns the suggestions regarding a revised process for selecting university-wide faculty awards. Chancellor Gee said that he has looked carefully at that issue and has discussed this issue among a number of people. Chancellor Gee said that he has sent a draft response to the Executive Committee of the Senate and he expects them to review his response very carefully. Chancellor Gee stated that he will have a report to give to this committee. He also explained that there is very little difference between what was recommended from the Senate and what his response has been. There are few issues that needed to be further clarified and we are in the process of doing that. Chancellor Gee assured the Senate that he will have a final resolution of that issue very soon.

And, finally, Chancellor Gee urged all in the Senate to attend the luncheon with Dr. Shalala.

He then opened the floor for questions.

Question (Senator Jacek Hawiger): Is there any way that you and this body can address the need for more life sciences in the new college curriculum?

Response (Chancellor Gee): Let me point out that this is a core curriculum issue, and the Dean of the College of Arts and Science will speak to this himself. I do not believe in

any way that this is devaluing of Life Sciences or any of the other programs. What it is saying is that in the core, you will have a wide range of opportunities and certainly the emphasis on the Life Sciences as one of those core opportunities that will continue to exist.

Chancellor Gee asked Dean McCarty for further clarification.

Response (Dean McCarty): I think what you just said epitomizes the nature of discourse on curricula on the College of Arts and Science. Everyone wants his or her discipline over everything else. And what happens then, is the whole curriculum falls apart. I think what we have tried to do is to provide a curriculum that will prepare a student well for life in the 21st century by giving them raw exposure that is summed up in a number of the disciplines represented in our college. We can't privilege one above the other. And that is exactly the kind of serious discussions that were held over three semesters. So one can fault any single aspect of the curriculum, but it holds together or it falls apart as a unit, not as individual pieces.

I think our committee did an excellent job of doing the best for our students. I think you will see in time that it will serve their needs quite well.

Follow-up Question (Senator Hawiger): So the process is the faculty of the College of Arts and Science voted for the curriculum that is going to be reviewed by the Faculty Senate now?

Response (Dean McCarty): I don't think the School of Medicine would like its curriculum reviewed by the Faculty Senate anymore than Peabody or Arts and Sciences would like it. I think you have to trust the faculty and the schools to give the best for their students. I stand behind the curriculum committee and our faculty.

Dean Gabbe seconded this statement from Dean McCarty.

Comment (Chair Ramsey): Let me simply confirm that the Senate has no plans to review this curriculum or any other curriculum.

Response (Chancellor Gee): Let me just say that what we have tried to do, is we tried to develop a core with coherence. A core in which there is a balance but it leaves sufficient room for people to grow in whatever it was they wanted go in social sciences in the life sciences and humanities is the model we are after. To say that we are not emphasizing the life sciences is unfair; to say that we are overemphasizing or underemphasizing any area is not correct. What we are doing is developing a core which then allows us to move to a more coherent set of requirements from the various departments within the college or the university.

Comment (Senator Hawiger): In response to the comment by our distinguished chair, I want to refer to the bylaws of the University, Point D where the Senate may, under the

constitution be vested with the power to review and evaluate the educational policies and practices of the University.

Comment (Chair Ramsey): One of the things we discussed at the first special Executive Session in October was opening the process of planning the agenda to all Senators and not simply to the Executive Committee. So I am suggesting that if you feel strongly about this that you write a memorandum to the Executive Committee and to your fellow senators.

Chair Ramsey recognized Beth Conklin, chair of the Senate Affairs committee to present a recommendation from Senate Affairs. Chair Ramsey explained that this concerns a proposed change to the Senate's rules of order, and that under those rules of order, we cannot vote on the proposal at this meeting. It needs to be presented at this meeting and then it will be voted on at the following meeting by the full Senate.

Next Item on the Agenda – Recommendation from Senate Affairs Committee

Senator Beth Conklin stated that the recommendation is to separate the Offices of Parliamentarian and Chair of Senate Affairs. This would allow the appointment of another individual as Parliamentarian, and that Parliamentarian might either be a Senator or a non-Senator. The change would allow us to have the expertise of someone who really knows Roberts' Rules of Order and the Senate Rules rather than require each new chair of Senate Affairs to learn Roberts' Rules on top of his other committee duties.

Senator Conklin explained that both the Senate Affairs Committee and the Executive Committee feel this makes eminent good sense. The recommendation is being introduced for informational purposes today. We will vote on it next time. Senator Conklin then explained what the revision would entail (see link: <http://www.vanderbilt.edu/facultysenate/files/Parliamentarianrec.pdf>).

Senator Conklin opened the floor for questions or comments.

Comment (Senator Mary Ann Horn): As former chair of the Senate Affairs Committee, I agree that this is a good idea.

Question (Senator Mark Ellingham): Do we have any history on why this was set up this way in the first place?

Response (Chair Ramsey): We could speculate. I think the idea was that the Senate Affairs Committee, which is concerned with the government of the Senate should be chaired by someone who is familiar with parliamentary procedure.

After hearing no other questions or comments, Chair Ramsey thanked Senator Conklin and moved on to old business.

Next Item on the Agenda – Motion to endorse statement on diversity and tolerance at Vanderbilt

Chair Ramsey introduced Senator Michael Bess and invited him to speak on this resolution before the Senate (see link to resolution at: <http://www.vanderbilt.edu/facultysenate/files/diver2ndrev.pdf>).

Senator Bess explained that this is the third iteration of this text, and it that has gotten longer each time. The statement was drafted by Carolyn Dever of the English Department, then discussed between Carolyn Dever, Beth Conklin and himself. Then, it was brought before the Senate. It was initially discussed in November, and the Senate decided to table it at that time. Suggestions were made for revision. Senator Bess then went back, revised it, and presented it again in December. At this Senate meeting, there was more discussion and more suggestions for revision. The drafters went back a third time and this time they asked their Senate colleagues to send an e-mail to Senator Bess if they had specific suggestions on the final version.

Senator Bess explained that the drafters of the resolution made some changes in response to those e-mails. Overall, the drafters feel that this statement has gotten clearer, more incisive and has become a better statement as a result of this process. The drafters feel that overall the statement is a much better statement than when they first started, and they want to thank both the people who made suggestions for revisions in the meetings and also people who sent them e-mails suggesting revisions.

Senator Bess explained that if the Senate adopts this statement, it will be the first time the Senate will have adopted this kind of statement of principle as far as anyone knows. The drafters would also like to circulate the statement among the faculty to allow them to sign it. The drafters would also like to publicize this in the *Hustler* and the *Register*. The drafters would like for the Vanderbilt community to be aware that this statement has been adopted.

Chair Ramsey explained that since the Senate has devoted extensive time in the previous two meetings to discussing the statement, the Executive Committee would like to introduce a resolution to limit debate now to ten minutes.

He went on to state that since this is a committee motion, it does not require a second, and that a motion to limit debate cannot be debated or amended.

The motion to limit debate to ten minutes was passed unanimously.

Chair Ramsey opened the floor for discussion.

Comment (Dean Conway-Welch): I would just like to say that I think this would compliment work that I am currently involved with in co-chairing a committee on diversity in the health care professions.

Chair Ramsey asked for any other discussion. Hearing none, he called for a vote on this resolution. The motion was passed unanimously.

Next Item on the Agenda – Report and recommendation from PEAFF

Chair Ramsey recognized Senator James Ely to give the report and recommendation from the PEAFF committee.

Senator Ely presented the report and recommendation from the PEAFF committee on the proposed revisions of the faculty grievance procedures (see link at: <http://www.vanderbilt.edu/facultysenate/files/FinalFacManRevWeb.pdf>).

Senator Ely stated that the text of the proposal had been available on the Faculty Senate web page since December and expressed the hope that the Senators had had an opportunity to review it.

Senator Ely thanked the members of the PEAFF committee and explained that this written proposal had been extensively reworked to take into account concerns raised by Senators and the university administration. This labor-intensive process necessitated frequent meetings for all committee members.

Senator Ely recognized the contributions of John McCarthy as outgoing chair. He said that he had labored long and hard to bring this project to fruition.

Senator Ely gave a brief word of background to place this report into perspective. In 1998, under former Provost Thomas Burish, a decision was made to split off from PEAFF's purview all grievances arising from decisions relating to reappointment, tenure, and promotion.

PEAFF retained jurisdiction over other grievable matters. A grievance relating to reappointment, tenure and promotion issues is handled by an ad hoc committee whose membership is different from PEAFF. Questions were raised as to how well this bifurcated process is working. In September of 2002, the Senate voted to reopen the question on whether reappointment, tenure and promotion grievances should be handled by a Senate committee. PEAFF was charged with the task of undertaking this assessment. The matter was again debated by the Senate in the Spring of 2003. The decision was made that PEAFF should continue its deliberations in order to refine its proposal. In the course of these discussions, the committee benefited from searching questions and constructing comments from Provost Nick Zeppos.

PEAFF unanimously endorsed these revisions and believes that they represent an improvement over the present procedures. Senator Ely then briefly highlighted the most salient points in the proposed new grievance procedure.

First, the proposal retains the separate ad hoc committee for reappointment, tenure and promotion grievances. There has been relatively little experience with the bifurcated

system to date, and PEAFF was not persuaded that a radical overhaul of the present system was indicated. Moreover, the members of PEAFF and especially the chair have a full plate of other responsibilities. It may simply be more than PEAFF can handle to start possibly lengthy hearings into tenure and promotion related grievances.

Second, PEAFF increases the time to file a grievance from the current 30 days after a faculty member is notified in writing of a final decision concerning reappointment, tenure or promotion to 60 days. This makes the time line for filing such a grievance consistent with the time for grievances other than those arising from reappointment, tenure, and promotion.

Third, although PEAFF proposed retaining the separate ad hoc process, it also proposed several changes that give PEAFF a role in the initial response to a grievance relating to reappointment, tenure and promotion. As the procedure now stands, a faculty member files a grievance with the process chair who must then initiate the process of forming an ad hoc tenure committee by contacting the chair of the Faculty Senate. The ad hoc committee must be selected and then meet to determine if the grievance was filed in a time manner, and whether it states one of the grounds upon which a grievance may be considered.

PEAFF proposes to streamline that process. Senator Ely explained that in the proposal before the Senate, the chair of PEAFF serves as the initial point of contact. It is hoped that a potential grievant will consult informally with the Chair of PEAFF so that together they may explore alternative solutions to the subject matter of the possible grievance.

If the dispute cannot be resolved in this informal manner, the grievant will then file the grievance with the Chair of PEAFF and PEAFF will officially determine whether the grievance was filed in a timely manner and whether it states one of the enumerated grounds.

Senator Ely pointed out that the advantages of this proposal are several. The Chair of PEAFF is an elected member of the Senate and commonly has experience in seeking informal solutions to possible grievances. Moreover, by having PEAFF make an initial review of the grievance, this decision is committed to a body experienced in making final determinations. This step may also avoid the need to constitute an ad hoc committee to make these determinations. The appointment of an ad hoc committee is a vexing task for the Chair of the Senate and one that consumes a great deal of time and energy of the faculty members appointed.

Under PEAFF's proposal, an ad hoc committee would not be named until after determination had been made by PEAFF that the grievance meets the criteria set forth in the *Faculty Manual*. Grievances that do not satisfy these requirements would be dismissed.

In short, the committee proposes to retain the threshold role of PEAFF with respect to tenure and promotion related grievances and hopes to avoid the need to constitute an ad

hoc committee except with a grievance that's timely and states one of the enumerating grounds for the grievance.

Senator Ely noted that Provost Zeppos, who was not present at the Senate meeting, had expressed some reservations about this proposal. Specifically, he is concerned about potential overlap and confusion between the role of PEAFF and the power of the ad hoc committee. Senator Ely has spoken at length with the Provost about this and the role envisioned for PEAFF with respect to promotion and tenure related grievances is quite narrow.

PEAFF only performs a preliminary screening function and does not conduct a hearing into the merits of the tenure matter.

Fourth, another significant part of PEAFF's proposal is to broaden the basic pool of colleagues eligible to serve on the ad hoc committee. Among other requirements, the *Faculty Manual* now provides that three of the five members of the ad hoc committee must have previously served on one of the university's promotion and tenure review committees. This restriction has resulted in a relatively narrow pool of faculty members eligible to serve on the ad hoc committee. Senator Ely explained that it was his understanding that, in the past, this limitation has on occasion made it difficult for the Chair of the Faculty Senate to constitute such a committee. The committee feels strongly that it is important to broaden the pool of those who can serve in this important capacity.

Five, the committee seeks to clarify the access of the ad hoc committee to personnel files. The manual now requires that such files will be provided unless the Provost or Vice-Chancellor for Health Affairs determines that they are not relevant. This means, in essence, that the appropriate administrator determines the relevance of the information in the files.

The committee proposes to change this to provide that the designated files should be furnished until the Provost or Vice-Chancellor for Health Affairs determines that the information is too sensitive. In this situation, the ad hoc chair will be given the files and be permitted to prepare a confidential summary for the committee.

Senator Ely explained that it is the committee's position that the ad hoc committee itself, which is charged with making a decision on the merits of the grievance, should determine whether the information in the files is relevant to its inquiry.

The final report of a grievance committee, whether PEAFF or an ad hoc committee for promotion and tenure related grievances, is submitted to the Chancellor. The *Faculty Manual* at present provides that if the Chancellor decides not to concur with the report, the Chancellor should meet with the grievance committee in an effort to reach agreement. There is no time for the Chancellor to make such a decision.

The committee proposes to change this by requiring that the Chancellor communicate in writing to the committee within 30 days whether he or she can concur in the report. If the

Chancellor decides not to concur, the proposal requires that the Chancellor and the grievance committee meet within 90 days of the committee's submission of its final report.

The committee fully recognizes that the Chancellor has many claims on his time and has no wish to be unreasonable or to force a premature decision. At the same time, it seems appropriate to set an orderly time frame within which decisions should be made. In fairness to members of the grievance committee, who take their duties seriously, to say nothing of the grievant, they should receive a timely response to their recommendations.

Senator Ely opened the floor for questions.

Question (Senator Beth Conklin): What kind of records would be kept in the Faculty Senate office?

Response (Senator Ely): The records with the grievance are to be retained in the Faculty Senate office as part of the Senate records.

Question (Senator Beth Conklin): And that would state what the grievance was, how it was handled, what the outcome was?

Response (Senator Ely): How it was handled, what the disposition was, that's correct.

Question (Senator Beth Conklin): And that would be open to any member of the faculty?

Response (Senator Ely): No, because that would destroy the confidentiality of the process.

Question (Senator Beth Conklin): So this would be for use by future committees.

Response (Senator Ely): Possible use by future committees, yes. It would not be open for just any curious person who wanted to go through it.

We try very hard, certainly I know the ad hoc committee, on which I have served on occasion tries very hard to maintain confidentiality.

Question (Senator Frank Wcislo): My question relates to lines 117 through 119. If the Provost or Vice Chancellor decides to provide the requested files to the ad hoc chair the reasons for the decisions must be communicated in writing to the ad hoc chair and the chair of the Faculty Senate. Does that then actually result in a situation in which the personnel file in question will never be made available to the relevant committee so that ultimately the report of the Chancellor would in essence have to acknowledge the unavailability of information?

Response (Senator Ely): I believe that is correct. In other words, PEAFF or the ad hoc committee has no way of forcing the opening of these files. We have tried to move away from the relevance standard to the sensitivity standard, believing that, in fact, that is a more appropriate standard. As it is, we do provide that, even if it is highly sensitive, the chair of the committees should be able to take a look at the files and prepare a summary. We thought that was a reasonable compromise under the circumstances. I am bothered by the thought that an administrator determines what's relevant to an inquiry—the committee has to determine what is relevant. This usually comes up when you have to go to the comparable files in a tenure promotion type of breakdown. And I can appreciate that they don't want comparable files talked about all over the university. But to deny access means that the committee is virtually stymied. All we can do at that point is to report that we were unable to make a complete investigation, which is not very satisfactory.

Question (Senator Michael Goldfarb): Was there any thought given in proposing this to the notion of being involved in the appeals process in a sense, or being involved after the ad hoc committee is appointed as opposed to before? In other words, it is written as if the PEAFF involvement is a preliminary involvement and happens before this other committee meets which supposedly has the real power to make a decision. What is the strategy and did they talk about being involved before as opposed to being involved after? Being involved after the fact means that you could react to their decision. If you agree with their decision then it seems to save time.

Response (Senator Ely): I don't think that PEAFF ever saw itself as in actually a kind of an appellate function from the ad hoc committee determination. I think we saw it as kind of a screening function.

I think your question, in a sense, goes to the very fundamental issue whether we should have two committees, whether we should have PEAFF handling now non-tenure/promotion related matters and a special committee handling tenure/promotion related matters. That has been debated by the Senate and I know there is more than one view on that. We felt, however, frankly, to take the step we have, which is to bring PEAFF back in the process but not to replace the ad hoc process committee which currently exists, and so our thought was that PEAFF could make preliminary findings. It does give the elected senators and then the committee composed of elected senators some role in the tenure/promotion and reappointment review process, but it doesn't entirely preempt the existing created structure. We thought that was a reasonably good balance. I see that other balances could be struck. I do think, though, that once the ad hoc committee has made a decision, it then goes to the Chancellor for review and PEAFF has no other role.

Follow-up Question (Senator Michael Goldfarb): What do you see as the role of PEAFF? My understanding is that these decisions had been done by elected faculty senators and then the administration essentially took away that responsibility, right? So elected faculty would like to retain that involvement?

Response (Senator Ely): I certainly think that that would be a fair rather basic summary. There were those who felt that Provost Burish pressed very hard to have the process changed. And, of course, the effect of the changes he introduced was to virtually eliminate the role of PEAFF and thus the elected senators from having any part in the tenure and promotion grievance process.

Now we are trying, in a sense, to reverse that in part. We are not going the whole step, because I don't think we have enough experience with this process to make the case that it is simply not working. We simply don't have enough experience.

But for many of us were bothered by the fact that the elected Senate committee, PEAFF, was given no role at all. So it was trying to, in effect, put PEAFF back in to a role and at the same time we are trying to stream line the process so that, say that Matt, hasn't got to compose an entire committee to then discover that, let's say the grievance wasn't filed within the times limit required. It seems like an awful lot of work.

Comment (Chair Ramsey): We have had two cases like that within the last year.

Comment (Senator John McCarthy): It is a *good* point that Michael raises and I think it also drives to the heart of the matter because the charge to PEAFF is to look at procedural issues and PEAFF is not interested in any substantive kind of judgment regarding the merits of reviewing a case relating to tenure/promotion review. So that the procedural issue should be foremost in our minds when we think about the relationship—this preliminary role that PEAFF would play. PEAFF would look at the grievable defenses as stated in the *Faculty Manual* and make a preliminary judgment. Once that judgment has been reached and if the judgment is that, indeed, it would appear as if there were grounds, then PEAFF withdraws and it is handed onto the ad hoc committee.

Question (Senator Goldfarb): It seems like such a small role, maybe I am underestimating the significance of that role, but if you have a jury of senior faculty members on PEAFF, are you just making procedural decisions?

Response (Senator McCarthy): That is correct and it is, the way I see it, a minor role. But what it does do is that it allows the ad hoc process to spare itself unnecessary effort.

Question (Senator Hawiger): What sort of expertise is necessary to evaluate the merit of a grievance?

Response (Senator Ely): I think we want to be very careful here that we are not trespassing into the territory of the university promotion and tenure review committee, because, of course, that is the body charged with reviewing the substantive merit of every application for tenure. The ad hoc process is only going to be initiated if there is some allegation that in some respect the procedure has been tainted.

Follow-up Question (Senator Hawiger): So, there is no evaluation of faculty member on the basis of merit in a grievance proceeding?

Response (Chair Ramsey): No. The ad hoc committee is not to answer the question, “Does this candidate deserve promotion, deserve tenure?” The question is “Have the four stipulated rights described in the faculty manual been violated—one of those four rights?”

Comment (Senator Hawiger): Since that is mostly a procedural process, PEAFF has a big say in this oversight of the procedural aspects of the grievance.

Response (Senator McCarthy): The procedural oversight function is a preliminary one because the ad hoc committee will have to determine once it begins its interviewing process and examination, whether there has been an internal procedural anomaly.

Question (Senator Goldfarb): So, a vote for this is essentially a vote to try to re-exert some kind of influence--elected faculty influence--on this grievance process.

Response (Senator Jim Ely): That’s correct.

Response (Senator McCarthy): There has been a concerted effort to comb the text to avoid repetition and to clarify formulations and make it more precise. The time line issues are also an important ingredient, which have been refined, expanded and in general the spirit of the community was to establish a clear formulation of the expectations and regulations, but do it in the spirit of ensuring that the potential grievant has every benefit of the doubt.

Chair Ramsey called for a vote on this resolution.

A vote was taken by paper ballot. The motion was carried unanimously.

Chair Ramsey thanked the members of the PEAFF committee and Senators McCarthy and Ely for their hard and good work.

Next Item on the Agenda – New Business

Chair Ramsey called for new business. Hearing none, he moved to business under Good of the Senate.

Next Item on the Agenda – Good of the Senate

Chair Ramsey then called for business under Good of the Senate. Hearing none, he declared the meeting adjourned. Meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dale Farran,
Secretary