Faculty Assembly Meeting – Special Meeting
November 7, 2007
Approved – FA Assembly November 27, 2007

Present: Bill Cooke, Mike DiPaola, Carl Hershner, Colleen Kennedy, John Lee, Heather Macdonald, Rip McAdams, Alan Meese, Terry Meyers, Todd Mooradian, Carol Sheriff, Gene Tracy, Tom White, Alan Fuchs

Absent: Katie Bragdon, Liz Canuel, Francie Cate-Arries, Larry Evans, Lisa Landino, Adam Potkay, Dee Royster, Laurie Wolf

Others in Attendance: President Gene Nichol, Provost Geoff Feiss, Josh Weiner

The meeting was called to order at 15:35 by Alan Meese

1. Bias Reporting Website
President Nichol discussed the history of the Bias Reporting website including the rationale for the website and the issues that have been raised regarding the site. The Executive Committee has met with the President and changes have been made based on suggestions from the Executive Committee. There was much discussion on a wide range of issues about this topic.

2. Discussion of the Faculty Handbook
Discussion of Section III. F 1-L (new draft provided by Todd Mooradian (minutes from Heather Macdonald and Tom White)

A key recurring question deals with what happens when an allegation of midconduct is made but there are not sufficient grounds to pursue the matter. There are three options.
   - no record kept
   - a record kept and faculty not informed
   - a record kept and faculty member informed.

The FAFAC, in their meeting, expressed concern that a record could be kept and the faculty member would not be notified. The current practice is that Office of Equal Opportunity (OEO) would notify a faculty member if there were a record kept about such allegations and the question came up about whether current practice is the same as past practice in the OEO office.

A wide-ranging discussion followed.
Questions - What about information gleaning during an administrative review? Response - This is only meant to apply to investigations of alleged misconduct.
Question – Can confidentiality of accuser be protected? Response – Could we have a system of confidentiality regarding the accuser rather than anonymous accusations in situations where there might be concerns about consequences to the accuser (e.g., influence on grades, research supervisor)? How does this relate to Office of Research Integrity which protects the whistle blower of the alleged misconduct.
Comment – importance of documentation at all stages.

Question - Can paragraph K be rewritten to be consistent with ORI whistle-blower guidelines—consistent with state and federal statutes? Response – there are no guidelines about notifying faculty—up to our interpretations. Kiersten should look at language we come up with.

Comment - don’t write these standards from perspective of classes of students (Ph.D., etc.)

The general sense of the Faculty Assembly – 1) if a record is kept, the faculty member should be notified and 2) the issue of the confidentiality of accuser is addressed. Writing Committee will redraft this paragraph with input from Todd Mooradian and will bring it back to the Faculty Assembly for discussion.

Comment: this applies to III F. 2 a also—keep consistent

Handbook sections III J and G distributed by Mooradian (not the version on the website) is to be reviewed before the November FA meeting.

Any new business/old business requested by President; none brought.

Meeting adjourned at 5:10 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Heather Macdonald
Secretary, Faculty Assembly