

**Academic Senate Executive Committee Minutes**  
**March 20, 2006**  
**(Approved)**

***Call to Order***

The Senate Chairperson, Lane Crothers, called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

***Present:*** , Marian Hampton, Lane Crothers, Dan Holland, Josh Garrison, Brett Schnepfer, Ross Richards, Nathalie op de Beeck, Provost John Presley, Eileen Fowles, President Al Bowman

***Absent:*** Farzaneh Fazel, Lynsey Wright

***Approval of Executive Committee Minutes of February 27, 2006***

**Motion XXXVII-55:** Motion by Senator Richards, seconded by Senator Garrison, to approve the Executive Committee Minutes of February 27, 2006. The word “gratia” was corrected to “grata” in the term “persona non grata”. The minutes, as revised, were unanimously approved.

***Oral Communications***

***01.30.06.01 From Nathalie op de Beeck: Follow up on University Writing Exam Questions***

Senator op de Beeck reported that the Writing Program is taking a look at the University Writing Exam. They will contact the Executive Committee when plans for revisions are in place.

***Distributed Communications:***

***02.28.06.01 From Michael Dicker: Concerns RE: Use of Electronic Devices in Classrooms***

**Senator Crothers:** The issue of the use of electronic devices in classrooms is worth a discussion. In some of the technical areas, they require the use of laptops and other kinds of devices in the classroom, so to create a blanket policy banning it would run counter to classroom requirements. On the other hand, there is no policy about expected codes of conduct in this regard, particularly the use of cell phones.

**Senator Hampton:** Is it not possible for the professor to tell them to shut down any such devices that are not related to classroom requirements?

**Senator Crothers:** I do think the broader question is one worthy of consideration. We might say there is no way to make a policy about it or we might say every professor has the authority to manage their class in the ways that they wish.

**Senator Holland:** I can understand them being upset about using a small computer to film the class.

**Senator Crothers:** That is part of the problem, because you don't know what is and isn't being used. The professor surely shouldn't have to spend half his class time checking laptops. It may be that the answer to the question is that this is fully within the domain of each individual professor to manage their class. Do we want to send it to Rules or to Academic Affairs?

**Senator Fowles:** Our college has addressed what we want in the classroom. I think that it would fall into the academic realm instead of rules.

**Senator Garrison:** Since it concerns the Student Code of Conduct, I think it should go to the Rules Committee. Or we could just say that it is up to the professor, department or college to make a statement.

**Senator Crothers:** If we decide that this deserves a hearing outside this room, it is a relatively low cost item and could raise some important issues in committee discussions.

**Provost Presley:** I think that a lot of the rules that we have in place presuppose that the instructor is the one who

decides what is good for the course. What is required in one classroom may be disruptive in another.

**Senator Crothers:** I brought it forward because almost everyone sees the university from their particular disciplinary and collegiate perspective. Because of that, there is more confusion and uncertainty across the university than there is clarity. The question, therefore, is, is this worth a conversation.

**Provost Presley:** I am just afraid that a discussion like this can easily degrade into deciding about what people should wear, for example.

**Senator Fowles:** I think that traditional rights and responsibilities of faculty answer this question.

**Senator Crothers:** I will respond to Professor Dicker that in light of the Classroom Disruption Policy, if you think this is disruptive, you have the right to control your classroom.

**03.02.06.01** *From Jan Shane: Academic Program Review Reports – Available at Milner Library*

The Academic Program Review Reports are currently at Milner's Reserve Desk for review. They will eventually come before the Senate as advisory items.

**03.20.06.01** *From Paul Borg, Academic Affairs Committee: Administrative Withdrawal Policy-Revised (Senate Action Item 3/29/06)*

**Senator Crothers:** We have from Paul Borg the re-revised Administrative Withdrawal Policy.

**Senator Fowles:** I had multiple conversations with Brent Paterson by e-mail during spring break about some of these recommendations in an effort to make sure that they didn't sound so coercive. Also, I wanted clarification about exactly what records they would obtain.

**Senator Crothers:** We also have the Classroom Disruption Policy on the Agenda as an Action Item; I don't think that there were any major changes since the last meeting.

**03.07.06.01** *From Lane Crothers/Provost Presley: Academic Freedom, Ethics and Grievance Committee Policies and Procedures - Revised*

**Senator Crothers:** The AFEGC Policy was revised by the Provost and I. We have also discussed it with the Chair of the AFEGC and he has discussed it with at least one of his colleagues on the committee. This revised document is a result of that process. Has the AFEGC Policy been traditionally voted on in the Senate or by the Faculty Caucus?

**Ms. James:** I believe by the Caucus.

**Senator Crothers:** If so, we will need to schedule a caucus on March 29. If the students wish to read this document, they are certainly entitled to. The primary effect of this was the removal of what John insists are 457 separate opportunities to complain.

**Provost Presley:** In the old document, there are 11 points at which a decision can be made.

**Senator Crothers:** Some of those were removed on my recommendation; others were removed on his recommendation. You will note in our existing policy, if you have gone through what we now call a preliminary hearing and the preliminary hearing committee has ruled against, you would appeal to the same committee that just ruled against you. Under our current process, you would go to the Chair of AFEGC who can call for a full hearing having never participated in any hearing whatsoever and having no information relevant to the case. I stripped that out because that makes no sense. If you don't know anything about the case or the issues, you have no basis on which to make a ruling about whether or not the case should continue.

**Provost Presley:** But it does continue to allow an appeal.

**Senator Crothers:** Absolutely correct. So you have a hearing and an appeal in a much more logical way.

**Senator Holland:** Can we get a flow chart?

**Senator Crothers:** John and I have altered the original flow chart and we will try to make sure that that is included. It is a dramatically simplified process. Some people are going to argue that because of its simplification, it has fewer faculty protections. I can tell you that the Chair and Vice Chair of the AFEGC looked at this document and were very pleased with the changes in procedure. Their point of view is that the current process is basically unworkable. It shortens the time in which you receive a final decision and subsequently seek legal advice.

**Provost Presley:** It also maintains its role in the ASPT process, which is important.

**President Bowman:** What was the rationale for Section 2A, jurisdiction of the committee? Then in 5, 6 and 7, you pull out specific examples. Do we need to be that explicit?

**Senator Crothers:** That is carryover, unedited language from the original document. Our intent was just to follow along the desire to spell out the general conditions. What had been going in most of that section was an intermixing of jurisdiction versus non-jurisdiction, so we wanted to separate the two. Also in number 7, we have the inclusion of a faculty associate and an NTT faculty representative.

**Provost Presley:** Can we invite the Chair and Vice Chair of AFEGC to the caucus?

**Senator Crothers:** Of course. John and I met with Paul Denhardt about these revisions. I did follow up and have heard nothing back from him.

***Proposed Agenda for Academic Senate Meeting of March 29, 2006:***

***Call to Order***

***Roll Call***

***Approval of Minutes of March 8, 2006***

***Guest Speaker: Representative Dan Brady***

***Chairperson's Remarks***

***Student Government Association President's Remarks***

***Administrators' Remarks***

- ***President Al Bowman***
- ***Provost John Presley***
- ***Vice President of Student Affairs Helen Mamarchev***
- ***Vice President of Finance and Planning Steve Bragg***

***Committee Reports***

- ***Academic Affairs Committee: Senator Borg***
- ***Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee: Senator Smith***
- ***Faculty Affairs Committee: Senator DeSantis***
- ***Planning and Finance Committee: Senator Burk***
- ***Rules Committee: Senator Holland***

***IBHE-FAC Report***

*Action Items:*

**11.10.05.04**      *Classroom Disruption Policy (Academic Affairs Committee)*

**03.20.06.01**      *Withdrawal Policy-Administrative and Involuntary (Academic Affairs Committee)*

*Information Item:*

*Faculty Code of Ethics and Related Policies (Rules Committee)*

*Communications:*

**03.21.06.02**      *College of Fine Arts April Events*

*Adjournment*

**Motion XXXVII-56:** Motion by Senator Fowles, seconded by Senator Hampton, to approve the Senate Agenda of March 29, 2006.

**Senator Crothers:** We will have as action items, the Classroom Disruption and the Withdrawal Policies.

**Senator Holland:** I would like to add the ethics document and related policies to the agenda as an information item. The revised Faculty Code of Ethics formerly came before the Senate simply as a communication item.

The agenda, as revised, was unanimously approved.

*Adjournment*