Faculty By-Laws Committee Meeting Minutes
10/3/2017

Present: Richard Nunan, George Pothering, Deanna Caveny-Noecker, Megan Gould, Liz Jurisich, Jannette Finch

The ad hoc committee has four recommendations:
1. Changing the package of deadlines
2. Language about the Hearing Committee authority to identify and adjudicate conflicts of interest
3. Changing constitution of the committee
4. Incorporating the Committee’s recommended modifications to the language of the missing page of “Post-Hearing Procedures,” that has already been restored in its original form.

Then, the ad hoc committee, did not address:
5. Training for committee members
6. Language insuring integrity of Grievants request for public hearing
7. Language clarifying roles of College Counsel & any Grievant advocate
8. Language explicating role of Hearing process as Faculty Governance

As per the thorny #2, who gets to determine at their discretion who is conflicted and issue a ruling?

Richard proposes an inquisitorial system. Remove the adversarial system. Empanel a trained committee, sans provost, to investigate the decision that was made. The committee reports to the provost, not the president.

Who should be involved in this discussion going forward? Perhaps let’s go back to the ad hoc committee.

We could invite the ad hoc committee to come to the next meeting and discuss.
We can consult AAUP language.
We can consult of institutional best practices.
We can lay down generic principles to work toward (reducing adversarial, moving authority in the room, reducing conflict of interest, etc.)