

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California 93407
ACADEMIC SENATE
805.756.1258

Meeting of the ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Tuesday, April 24, 2001
UU220, 3:00 to 5:00pm

- I. Minutes: approval of minutes for Academic Senate Executive Committee meeting of April 3, 2001 (pp. 2-3).
- II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):
- III. Reports:
 - A. Academic Senate Chair:
 - B. President's Office:
 - C. Provost's Office:
 - D. Statewide Senators:
 - E. CFA Campus President:
 - F. ASI Representatives:
 - G. Other:
- IV. Consent Agenda:
- V. Business Item(s):
 - A. **Appointment of committee members to Academic Senate committees for 2001-2003: (pp. 4-10).**
 - B. **Appointment of committee members to University-wide committees for 2001-2002: (pp. 11-13).**
 - C. **Resolution on Name Change for the Academic Senate Faculty Ethics Committee: Labhard, Chair of Faculty Ethics Committee (pp. 14-21).**
 - D. **[time certain 4pm] Foundation Board of Directors candidate presentations and election of nominee.**
- VI. Discussion Item(s):
- VII. Adjournment:

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California 93407
ACADEMIC SENATE
805.756.1258

*Minutes of the
Academic Senate Executive Committee
Tuesday, April 3, 2001
UU220, 3:00 to 5:00pm*

Preparatory: The meeting was opened at 3:13pm.

- I. Minutes: The minutes for Executive Committee meetings of January 30 and February 27, 2001 were approved without change.
- II. Communications and Announcements:
- III. Reports:
 - A. Academic Senate Chair:
 - B. President's Office:
 - C. Provost's Office:
 - D. Statewide Senators:
 - E. CFA Campus President:
 - F. ASI Representatives:
 - G. Other:
- IV. Consent Agenda:
- V. Business Item(s):


[The agenda was reordered to hear Business Items in the following order:]

 - E. **Resolution on Enrollment in General Education Courses:** This resolution addresses the problem of teaching writing-intensive courses when class size is larger than 25-35 students. Executive Committee members were asked to email their suggestions for short-term and long-term solutions to David Kann (English Department). The Executive Committee will meet after the Senate meeting of April 10 to review and agendize a revised resolution on this issue.
 - A. **Academic Senate/University-wide Committee Vacancies for 2000-2001:**

A Senate representative is needed to the Dean's Admissions Advisory Committee (DAAC) and to the Intellectual Property Review Committee (IPRC) for spring quarter 2001. Mei-Ling Liu will be contacted to serve on the DAAC this quarter. A message will be sent to faculty re the IPRC and interest statements will be requested in order to serve on this committee. It was suggested that interested candidates be interviewed by the Executive Committee.
 - B. **Appointment of Committee Members to Academic Senate Committees for 2001-2003:** Caucus chairs were asked to solicit the faculty in their colleges to fill remaining committee vacancies for 2001-2003. Appointment of committee members will be made at the next Executive Committee meeting.

- C. **Appointment of Committee Members to University-wide Committees for 2001-2002:** Appointment of Senate representatives to university-wide committees for 2001-2002 will be made at the next Executive Committee meeting. Nominations to the Foundation Board of Directors for 2001-2004 will be made at the April 24 Executive Committee meeting.
 - F. **Resolution on Possible Employment of Faculty Spouses:** This resolution encourages the University to work with employee unions to consider spouses of new faculty for campus positions. Numerous suggestions were made for revising the resolution. Resolution was agreed subject to committee chair's communications with Anna McDonald (HR) and revisions to the resolution as recommended.
 - D. **Resolution on Publication of Change of Major Criteria:** Agendized for the next Senate meeting.
- VI. Discussion Item(s):
- VII. Adjournment: Meeting was adjourned at 4:50pm.

Submitted by:


Margaret Camuso
Academic Senate

COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE
Faculty Interest Questionnaires Received for
Academic Senate Committee Vacancies for 2001-2003

	<u>Department</u>	<u>Order of Preference</u>
<u>Budget and Long Range Planning Committee</u>		
Steve Kaminaka* (incumbent)	Biores&AE	1 of 1
<u>Curriculum Committee</u>		
No Vacancy		
<u>Cultural Pluralism Requirement Subcommittee</u>		
<u>Faculty Affairs Committee</u>		
<u>Faculty Awards Committee</u>		
<u>Faculty Ethics Committee</u>		
David Warfield	CropSci	1 of 1
<u>Fairness Board</u>		
No Vacancy		
<u>Grants Review Committee</u>		
No Vacancy		
<u>Instruction Committee</u>		
No Vacancy		
<u>Library Committee</u>		
<u>Research and Professional Development Committee</u>		
Barry Eisenberg	EnvHortSci	1 of 1
Neal MacDougall	Agribus	1 of 1
<u>Student Grievance Board</u>		
No Vacancy		

* Willing to chair if release time were available

COLLEGE OF ARCHITECTURE AND ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN
Faculty Interest Questionnaires Received for
Academic Senate Committee Vacancies for 2001-2003

<u>Department</u>	<u>Order of Preference</u>
<u>Budget and Long Range Planning Committee</u>	
No Vacancy	
<u>Curriculum Committee</u>	
No Vacancy	
<u>Cultural Pluralism Requirement Subcommittee</u>	
No Vacancy	
<u>Faculty Affairs Committee</u>	
<u>Faculty Awards Committee</u>	
<u>Faculty Ethics Committee</u>	
<u>Fairness Board</u>	
No Vacancy	
<u>Grants Review Committee</u>	
<u>Instruction Committee</u>	
<u>Library Committee</u>	
No Vacancy	
<u>Research and Professional Development Committee</u>	
No Vacancy	
<u>Student Grievance Board</u>	

* Willing to chair if release time were available

COLLEGE OF BUSINESS
Faculty Interest Questionnaires Received for
Academic Senate Committee Vacancies for 2001-2003

	<u>Department</u>	<u>Order of Preference</u>
<u>Budget and Long Range Planning Committee</u>		
No Vacancy		
<u>Curriculum Committee</u>		
No Vacancy		
<u>Cultural Pluralism Requirement Subcommittee</u>		
<u>Faculty Affairs Committee</u>		
No Vacancy		
<u>Faculty Awards Committee</u>		
Michael Geringer	GISt&Law	1 of 1
<u>Faculty Ethics Committee</u>		
Mary Beth Armstrong	Acctg	1 of 1
<u>Fairness Board</u>		
Jack Robison (incumbent)	Acctg	1 of 1
<u>Grants Review Committee</u>		
No Vacancy		
<u>Instruction Committee</u>		
No Vacancy		
<u>Library Committee</u>		
Alden Shiers	Econ	1 of 1
<u>Research and Professional Development Committee</u>		
<u>Student Grievance Board</u>		
No Vacancy		

* Willing to chair if release time were available

COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
Faculty Interest Questionnaires Received for
Academic Senate Committee Vacancies for 2001-2003

	<u>Department</u>	<u>Order of Preference</u>
<u>Budget and Long Range Planning Committee</u>		
<u>Curriculum Committee</u>		
Mei-Ling Liu	CompSci	2 of 3
Helen Yu	ElecEngr	4 of 5
<u>Cultural Pluralism Requirement Subcommittee</u>		
<u>Faculty Affairs Committee</u>		
Helen Yu	ElecEngr	3 of 5
<u>Faculty Awards Committee</u>		
<u>Faculty Ethics Committee</u>		
No Vacancy		
<u>Fairness Board</u>		
Helen Yu	ElecEngr	5 of 5
<u>Grants Review Committee</u>		
David Braun*(incumbent)	ElecEngr	1 of 1
Dr. Taufik	ElecEngr	2 of 2
Mei-Ling Liu	CompSci	3 of 3
Helen Yu	ElecEngr	1 of 5
<u>Instruction Committee</u>		
No Vacancy		
<u>Library Committee</u>		
No Vacancy		
<u>Research and Professional Development Committee</u>		
Edward Sullivan (incumbent)	C&EEngr	1 of 1
Frank Owen	MatEngr	1 of 1
Dr. Taufik	ElecEngr	1 of 2
Mei-Ling Liu	CompSci	1 of 3
Helen Yu	ElecEngr	2 of 5
<u>Student Grievance Board</u>		

* Willing to chair if release time were available

COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS
Faculty Interest Questionnaires Received for
Academic Senate Committee Vacancies for 2001-2003

	<u>Department</u>	<u>Order of Preference</u>
<u>Budget and Long Range Planning Committee</u>		
No Vacancy		
<u>Curriculum Committee</u>		
No Vacancy		
<u>Cultural Pluralism Requirement Subcommittee</u>		
Linda Bomstad*	Philos	1 of 1
Steve McDermott	SpchComm	1 of 1
Carolyn Stefanco	History	1 of 1
Jean Williams	PoliSci	1 of 1
William Martinez	ModLg&Lt	1 of 2
<u>Faculty Affairs Committee</u>		
No Vacancy		
<u>Faculty Awards Committee</u>		
Carol MacCurdy (off Spring quarter)	English	1 of 1
<u>Faculty Ethics Committee</u>		
No Vacancy		
<u>Fairness Board</u>		
William Martinez	ModLg&Lit	2 of 2
<u>Grants Review Committee</u>		
Dan Krieger*	History	1 of 1
<u>Instruction Committee</u>		
No Vacancy		
<u>Library Committee</u>		
No Vacancy		
<u>Research and Professional Development Committee</u>		
No Vacancy		
<u>Student Grievance Board</u>		
No Vacancy		

* Willing to chair if release time were available

COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS/UCTE
Faculty Interest Questionnaires Received for
Academic Senate Committee Vacancies for 2001-2003

	<u>Department</u>	<u>Order of Preference</u>
<u>Budget and Long Range Planning Committee</u> No Vacancy		
<u>Curriculum Committee</u>		
<u>Cultural Pluralism Requirement Subcommittee</u> No Vacancy		
<u>Faculty Affairs Committee</u>		
<u>Faculty Awards Committee</u> Susan McBride*	UCTE	1 of 1
<u>Faculty Ethics Committee</u>		
<u>Fairness Board</u> Mike Sutliff	PE&K	1 of 1
<u>Grants Review Committee</u> No Vacancy		
<u>Instruction Committee</u>		
<u>Library Committee</u>		
<u>Research and Professional Development Committee</u> No Vacancy		
<u>Student Grievance Board</u>		

* Willing to chair if release time were available

PROFESSIONAL CONSULTATIVE SERVICES
Faculty Interest Questionnaires Received for
Academic Senate Committee Vacancies for 2001-2003

	<u>Department</u>	<u>Order of Preference</u>
<u>Budget and Long Range Planning Committee</u> Navjit Brar*	Library	1 of 2
<u>Curriculum Committee</u>		
<u>Cultural Pluralism Requirement Subcommittee</u> No Vacancy		
<u>Faculty Affairs Committee</u> No Vacancy		
<u>Faculty Awards Committee</u> No Vacancy		
<u>Faculty Ethics Committee</u> No Vacancy		
<u>Fairness Board</u> No Vacancy		
<u>Grants Review Committee</u> Navjit Brar*	Library	2 of 2
<u>Instruction Committee</u> Stacey Breitenbach	CENG Adv Ctr	1 of 1
<u>Library Committee</u> No Vacancy		
<u>Research and Professional Development Committee</u> No Vacancy		
<u>Student Grievance Board</u> No Vacancy		

* Willing to chair if release time were available

03.21.01

**Faculty Interest Questionnaires Received for
UNIVERSITY-WIDE COMMITTEES
Vacancies for 2001-2002**

	<u>Department</u>	<u>Order of Preference</u>
<u>(504/ADA) Accommodation Review Board</u> (2 Representatives/1 Vacancy)		
 <u>ASI Facilities and Operations Committee</u> (1 Representative/1 Vacancy) Gerald DeMers	 PE&K	 2 of 3
 <u>ASI Pace Committee</u> (1 Representative/1 Vacancy)		
 <u>ASI Student Senate</u> (1 Representative/1 Vacancy)		
 <u>Athletics Governing Board</u> (3 Representatives/1 Vacancy)		
Michael Colvin	Math	1 of 2
Doug Piirto	NRM	1 of 2
Gerald DeMers	PE&K	1 of 3
Camille O'Bryant	PE&K	1 of 3
Andrew Morris	History	3 of 4
 <u>Cal Poly Plan Steering Committee</u> (3 Representatives/3 Vacancies)		
David Warfield	CropSci	3 of 3
 <u>Campus Dining Advisory Committee</u> (1 Representative/1 Vacancy)		
Dr. Taufik	ElecEngr	2 of 3
 <u>Campus Fee Advisory Committee</u> (1 Representative/1 Vacancy)		
William Martinez	ModLg&Lt	1 of 2
 <u>Campus Planning Committee</u> (2 Representatives/2 Vacancies)		
Steven Marx (incumbent)	English	1 of 1
Cyd Ropp	SpchComm	1 of 1
Sandy Stannard	Arch	1 of 1
Christopher Yip	Arch	1 of 1
Linda Bomstad	Philo	2 of 3
David Warfield	CropSci	2 of 3
Navjit Brar	Library	1 of 4

Campus Safety and Risk Management Committee
(2 Representatives/1 Vacancy)

Richard Cavaletto (incumbent)
Bill Kellogg
Camille O'Bryant
Navjit Brar
Gerald DeMers

Biores&AE 1 of 1
AgEd&Comm 1 of 1
PE&K 2 of 3
Library 2 of 4
PE&K 3 of 3

Deans Admissions Advisory Committee
(2 Representatives/2 Vacancies)

Mei-Ling Liu

CompSci 1 of 2

Deans Enrollment Planning Advisory Committee
(1 Representative/1 Vacancy)

Phil Fanchon
Kent Morrison
Linda Bomstad

Econ 1 of 1
Math 1 of 1
Philo 3 of 3

Disabled Students Advisory Committee
(4 Representatives/2 Vacancies)

Luann McDonald (incumbent)
Shelley Aleshire
Sharron Thrasher
Rebecca Ellis

Finan. Aid 1 of 1
DRC 1 of 1
Counseling Serv. 1 of 2
Mgmt 1 of 3

El Corral Bookstore Advisory Committee
(2 Representatives/1 Vacancy)

Jerome Breitenbach (incumbent)
Jay Devore
Navjit Brar
Andrew Morris

ElecEngr 1 of 1
Stats 1 of 1
Library 3 of 4
History 4 of 4

Faculty Development Grants Review Committee
(1 Representative/1 Vacancy)

Michael Colvin
Dan Krieger
Mei-Ling Liu
Rebecca Ellis
Navjit Brar

Math 2 of 2
History 2 of 2
CompSci 2 of 2
Mgmt 2 of 3
Library 4 of 4

Foundation Board of Directors
(2 Representatives/1 Vacancy)

Edward Sullivan (incumbent)
Doug Piirto

C&EEngr 1 of 1
NRM 2 of 2

International Education and Programs Council

(1 Representative/1 Vacancy)

Michael Geringer (incumbent)	GISt&Law	1 of 1
Stu Goldenberg	Math	1 of 1
Wayne Montgomery	Library	1 of 1
Frank Owen	MechEngr	1 of 1
Patricia Troxel	English	1 of 1
Dan Villegas	Econ	1 of 1
Del Dingus	SoilSci	1 of 2
Dan Krieger	History	1 of 2
Carolyn Stefanco	History	1 of 3
David Warfield	CropSci	1 of 3
Andrew Morris	History	1 of 4
William Martinez	ModLg&Lt	2 of 2

Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC)

(1 Representative/1 Vacancy)

Instructional Advisory Committee on Computing (IACC)

(1 Representative/1 Vacancy)

Dr. Taufik	ElecEngr	1 of 3
------------	----------	--------

Provost's Council

(1 Representative/1 Vacancy)

John Hampsey	English	1 of 1
Linda Bomstad	Philo	1 of 3
Del Dingus	SoilSci	2 of 2
Carolyn Stefanco	History	3 of 3

Resource Use Committee

(3 Representatives/1 Vacancy)

Andrew Morris	History	2 of 4
---------------	---------	--------

Student Health Advisory Committee

(1 Representative/1 Vacancy)

Substance Use and Abuse Advisory Committee

(1 Representative/1 Vacancy)

Jack Robison	Acctg	1 of 1
Jean Williams	PoliSci	2 of 2

University Diversity Enhancement Council

(2 Representatives/1 Vacancy)

Donald Ryujin	Psyc&HD	1 of 1
Jean Williams	PoliSci	1 of 2
Sharron Thrasher	Counseling Serv.	2 of 2
Carolyn Stefanco	History	2 of 3
Rebecca Ellis	Mgmt	3 of 3
Camille O'Bryant	PE&K	3 of 3
Dr. Taufik	ElecEngr	3 of 3

Adopted:

**ACADEMIC SENATE
Of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, CA**

**AS-____-01/FE
RESOLUTION ON
Name Change for the Academic Senate
Faculty Ethics Committee**

- 1 WHEREAS, The Academic Senate adopted AS-501-98/ETF, Resolution on Faculty Dispute
2 Process, on June 2, 1998; and
3
4 WHEREAS, The Resolution on Faculty Dispute Process charged the Faculty Ethics Committee
5 with creating procedures to implement a faculty dispute review process; and
6
7 WHEREAS, The Faculty Ethics Committee has completed its procedural document titled
8 "Faculty Dispute Review Committee Procedures" (attached); and
9
10 WHEREAS, The Faculty Ethics Committee's charge is more accurately reflected in the name
11 Faculty Dispute Review Committee; therefore, be it
12
13 RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate adopt the attached "Faculty Dispute Review
14 Committee Procedures", and be it further
15
16 RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate Bylaws be modified to reflect the name change from
17 Faculty Ethics Committee to Faculty Dispute Review Committee.

Proposed by: Faculty Ethics Committee
Date: April 11, 2001

FACULTY DISPUTE REVIEW COMMITTEE PROCEDURES

Background

1 The resolution to form this Committee was proposed by the Faculty Affairs Committee and the
2 Ethics Task Force and was passed by the Academic Senate on June 2, 1998 (AS-501-98/ETF).
3 The Committee was charged with developing and implementing a faculty dispute process
4 consistent with the AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics.
5
6

Introduction

7
8
9 The American Association of University Professors has recognized
10 that membership in the academic profession carries with it special
11 responsibilities and has affirmed these responsibilities in major policy
12 statements. 'In the academic profession, the individual institution of
13 higher learning provides assurance and so should normally handle
14 questions concerning propriety of conduct within its own framework
15 by reference to faculty groups... Civility between faculty members is
16 a matter of faculty responsibility...'
17

18 As colleagues, professors have obligations as members in the community
19 of scholars. Professors do not discriminate against or harass colleagues.
20 They respect and defend the free inquiry of associates. In the exchange of
21 criticism and ideas, professors show due respect for the opinion of others.
22 Professors should accept their share of faculty responsibilities for the
23 governance of their institution.
24

Preamble/Charge

25
26
27 The Committee represents a resource where faculty can have disputes reviewed by peers for a
28 resolution recommendation. Faculty includes full-time and part-time "teaching" faculty. The
29 Committee was formed to address disputes between faculty members which can not be resolved
30 by other means, deals with disputes between/among faculty members only, and attempts to reach
31 equitable resolution. Faculty should make every attempt at informal resolution prior to appealing
32 to this Committee. Appearance before the Committee is voluntary, and proceedings are kept
33 confidential by Committee members. The Committee recognizes the obligation to report any
34 illegal activity. The authority of this Academic Senate Committee is limited as a recommending
35 body to the Provost. The Committee does not deal with decisions or questions of professional
36 review such as RPT and FMI. (See sections which follow that detail jurisdiction and
37 procedures.)
38

Membership/Terms/Chair/Quorum

The Faculty Dispute Review Committee shall consist of six (6) tenured faculty members representing each of the Colleges and one representative from Professional Consultative Services, appointed by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate for staggered two-year terms. The University Ombudsman will be a non-voting ex-officio member of the Committee. The members of the Committee shall elect the Committee chair. A quorum shall consist of 5 voting Committee members. The Committee may invite various consultants to attend to provide advice on university policies and procedures.

Jurisdiction

Matters within the Committee's jurisdiction

- A. Violations of AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics (Appendix A)
- B. Disputes that may arise between faculty members that seriously impair their ability to function effectively as member(s) of the university.

Matters excluded from the Committee's jurisdiction

- A. Disputes in which the relief requested is beyond the power of the University to grant.
- B. Disputes being considered by another dispute resolution entity or under another procedure within the University (e.g. sexual harassment, amorous relationships, etc.).
- C. Matters that fall under Collective Bargaining Agreements.
- D. Disputes being heard or litigated before agencies or courts outside the University.

Informal Resolution of A Dispute

Faculty should make every effort at informal resolution prior to appealing to the Faculty Dispute Review Committee. Faculty might converse with other faculty, department heads/chairs, deans, staff in the Employee Assistance Program, and/or the University Ombudsman.

Procedures for Requesting A Dispute Resolution

Where informal resolution is found to be unsuccessful, faculty may request dispute resolution by the Committee.

To initiate the process, the faculty member (hereafter, the applicant) shall submit the written request (8 copies) to the chair of the Committee. The request shall contain:

- A. A concise statement of the conduct which is the subject of the request,
- B. The person(s) involved,
- C. The person(s) recommended as witness(es) (if needed by the Committee),
- D. The resolution sought,
- E. The efforts already made by the applicant to resolve the dispute, and
- F. An affirmation that the dispute is not pending in some other forum in or outside the University.

A request may contain more than one claim of wrongful action and seek more than one form of relief; separate claims must be specifically identified. A request should be presented in a timely fashion and should be raised within 12 months of the perceived dispute. If special circumstances exist, the Committee may choose to review a dispute older than 12 months. The request may not exceed five, double-spaced, typed pages. Along with the request, supporting or clarifying documentation, not exceeding 10 additional pages, may be included. The Committee may also request further documentation.

Basis for Rejection of A Request

Failure to Meet Criteria

The Committee may reject a request that does not meet stated criteria; defects may be corrected, and a new request may be submitted.

The Committee may initially reject a request if adequate effort to pursue available avenues of informal resolution has not been made.

Jurisdiction

The Committee may decide the request does not fall within its jurisdiction and reject the request.

Insubstantial

The Committee may reject the request if it is insubstantial or the dispute is not sufficiently related to the concerns of the academic community.

Committee's Response to A Request

Notification to Applicant

If the request falls within the Committee's jurisdiction, the Committee shall notify the applicant who then shall be required to send to the person(s) whose alleged conduct is the basis for the request (hereafter, the responder) a copy of all materials submitted earlier to the Committee.

Notification to Responder

The Committee shall request a written response from the responder. The response must meet the same standards specified for requests: the position stated concisely in no more than 5 pages with a limit of up to 10 pages of supporting or clarifying documentation, suggested witnesses, etc.

Time Limits

The Committee may set reasonable time requirements for the submission of materials. If no response is made, the Committee may take such inaction into consideration in its resolution of the dispute

Scope and Conduct of A Dispute Review

The nature and means employed in pursuing the review (review of submitted materials, interviewing of relevant parties, and gathering of relevant information) shall be at the discretion of the Committee. A review shall be as extensive as necessary to resolve the dispute fairly. The Committee may conduct its own interviews, request additional evidence from the parties, interview individuals it considers potentially helpful, and review the written materials before it. At any stage of a review, the Committee may exercise its ability and discretion to resolve the dispute through mediation and reconciliation between the parties or refer the matter to an appropriate dispute resolution resource available within the University.

Voluntary Process

The process is voluntary, and any witness can choose not to participate.

Burden of Proof

The burden of proof by a preponderance of evidence lies with the applicant.

Quorum

A quorum of the Committee will be available during a review; a Committee member may be excused if s/he feels a conflict of interest or inability to be fair and impartial in reviewing a case.

Substitute(s)

The Committee may request the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate to appoint substitutes.

Use of Attorneys

Attorneys may not be used by either party during any part of a Committee review.

New Evidence

Any new evidence made available to the Committee must be provided to all parties with the chance of rebuttal.

Witnesses

The Committee may meet with any witnesses deemed appropriate to reach a resolution.

Privacy/Confidentiality

Each review will be held in private. Content of the review will be confidential for Committee members except for the need to interview witnesses to reach a resolution or when illegal activity is discovered and which must be reported.

Timing

If hearings are deemed appropriate, the Committee may impose time restrictions for the submission of materials and/or length of presentations. Every effort will be made to expedite review and reach timely resolutions.

Concluding the Investigation

A review shall be concluded when any of the following occur (no report will be made to the Provost for A, B, or C):

- A. The Committee rejects the request,
- B. The dispute is resolved with the consent of the parties,
- C. The Committee makes a recommendation which both parties accept, or
- D. The Committee issues its report to the Provost.

Report to the Provost

If there is a report to the Provost, the Committee shall indicate in writing the results of its review. The form of the report to the Provost may be:

- A. A statement that the Committee could not resolve the dispute.
- B. A recommendation for further investigation by the Provost.
- C. A recommendation for action.

The report should be signed by those who concur with the findings. Abstentions will be recorded, and minority reports may be included with the report by those who desire.

Further Action

Within 30 days after receipt of the Committee report, the Provost may accept the report, affirm the recommendation, meet with the committee to discuss objections, take further action, and /or reject the recommendation.

The Provost's decision shall be final and conclusive, and the matter in question shall be deemed closed.

Use of Committee Review for Subsequent Dispute Resolution Intervention

Should either party seek to utilize any subsequent internal or external dispute resolution intervention, only the final report of the Faculty Dispute Review Committee will be made available.

-- Appendix A --

Statement on Professional Ethics

The statement which follows, a revision of a statement originally adopted in 1966, was approved by Committee B on Professional Ethics, adopted by the Council, and endorsed by the Seventy-third Annual Meeting in June 1987.

INTRODUCTION

From its inception, the American Association of University Professors has recognized that membership in the academic profession carries with it special responsibilities. The Association has consistently affirmed these responsibilities in major policy statements, providing guidance to professors in such matters as their utterances as citizens, the exercise of their responsibilities to students and colleagues, and their conduct when resigning from an institution or when undertaking sponsored research. The *Statement on Professional Ethics* that follows sets forth those general standards that serve as a reminder of the variety of responsibilities assumed by all members of the profession.

In the enforcement of ethical standards, the academic profession differs from those of law and medicine, whose associations act to ensure the integrity of members engaged in private practice. In the academic profession the individual institution of higher learning provides this assurance and so should normally handle questions concerning propriety of conduct within its own framework by reference to a faculty group. The Association supports such local action and stands ready, through the general secretary and Committee B, to counsel with members of the academic community concerning questions of professional ethics and to inquire into complaints when local consideration is impossible or inappropriate. If the alleged offense is deemed sufficiently serious to raise the possibility of adverse action, the procedures should be in accordance with the 1940 *Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure*, the 1958 *Statement on Procedural Standards in Faculty Dismissal Proceedings*, or the applicable provisions of the *Association's Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure*.

THE STATEMENT

I. Professors, guided by a deep conviction of the worth and dignity of the advancement of knowledge, recognize the special responsibilities placed upon them. Their primary responsibility to their subject is to seek and to state the truth as they see it. To this end professors devote their energies to developing and improving their scholarly competence. They accept the obligation to exercise critical self-discipline and judgment in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge. They practice intellectual honesty. Although professors may follow subsidiary interests, these interests must never seriously hamper or compromise their freedom of inquiry.

II. As teachers, professors encourage the free pursuit of learning in their students. They hold before them the best scholarly and ethical standards of their discipline. Professors demonstrate respect for students as individuals and adhere to their proper roles as intellectual guides and counselors. Professors make every reasonable effort to foster honest academic conduct and to ensure that their evaluations of students reflect each student's true merit. They

respect the confidential nature of the relationship between professor and student. They avoid any exploitation, harassment, or discriminatory treatment of students. They acknowledge significant academic or scholarly assistance from them. They protect their academic freedom.

III As colleagues, professors have obligations that derive from common membership in the community of scholars. Professors do not discriminate against or harass colleagues. They respect and defend the free inquiry of associates. In the exchange of criticism and ideas professors show due respect for the opinions of others. Professors acknowledge academic debt and strive to be objective in their professional judgment of colleagues. Professors accept their share of faculty responsibilities for the governance of their institution.

IV. As members of an academic institution, professors seek above all to be effective teachers and scholars. Although professors observe the stated regulations of the institution, provided the regulations do not contravene academic freedom, they maintain their right to criticize and seek revision. Professors give due regard to their paramount responsibilities within their institution in determining the amount and character of work done outside it. When considering the interruption or termination of their service, professors recognize the effect of their decision upon the program of the institution and give due notice of their intentions.

V. As members of their community, professors have the rights and obligations of other citizens. Professors measure the urgency of these obligations in the light of their responsibilities to their subject, to their students, to their profession, and to their institution. When they speak or act as private persons they avoid creating the impression of speaking or acting for their college or university. As citizens engaged in a profession that depends upon freedom for its health and integrity, professors have a particular obligation to promote conditions of free inquiry and to further public understanding of academic freedom.