

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE MEETING
MONDAY, APRIL 14, 2003
LEAVEY PROGRAM ROOM
(APPROVED 5/14/03 WITH CORRECTIONS)

PRESENT: Arend, Bates, D. Betz, P. Betz, Bonanno, Douglas Brown, Clarke, Cleary Connor-Linton, Davis, Fink, Friedman, Gale, Glazer, Haramati, Hirsh, Hussey, Larsen, Lieber, Lightfoot, Little, Mann, Massaro, McAuliffe, McFadden, S.J., A. O'Donnell, Pfeiffer, Rameh, Stent, J. Walsh, S.J., T. Walsh, Walters, Witek, S.J.,

ABSENT: Andrews (sabb), Areen, Bloch, Byrne, Cohn, Collea, Collins, Cumby, Danielson, Deller Ross, Diamond, Dimolitsas, Dover, Ernst, Gallucci, Goldfrank, Haft, Hauser, Iglarsh, Kromer, Lachat, Linafelt, Mastorovich,, McCabe, McGrail, Moran Cruz, Morris, Mujal-Leon (sabb), Murphy, Oakley, J. O'Donnell, Owens, Pedrick, Richardson (sabb), Rom, Ronkainen, Salles-Reese, Shad, Sistrunk, Sitterson, Sanz, Suyderhoud, Taylor, Temple, Verbalis, Vroman, Walker, Weidenbruch, Weiss,

GUESTS: Ardoth Hassler (Associate Vice President, University Information Services), Brian Reilly (University Network Security Officer)

The meeting was called to order at 4:20 p.m. by Professor Wayne Davis.

The minutes of the March 6, 2003 meeting of the Faculty Senate were approved.

It was asked whether those persons who ask questions during Senate meetings could be identified by name in the minutes as was done in the past. Professor Davis noted that Professor Friedman, the Faculty Senate Secretary, has attempted to provide more concise minutes by removing those details. A brief discussion ensued.

Professor Tony Arend spoke about the revision of the Faculty Handbook, which is being carried out by the Faculty Governance Committee. The last printed version of the Faculty Handbook appeared in 1999, and is quite outdated.

The new proposal is to develop a "Faculty Manual." It would consist of three sections. The first section would contain general introductory material, such as University history, an organizational chart and a description of administrative positions. It would have no binding authority and would not include direct legal matters relating to contracts. The second section would be called the "Faculty Handbook" and would consist of provisions that affect fundamental faculty rights and responsibilities, including such items as provisions on rank and tenure, responsibilities of administrative officers, University governance and the Faculty Grievance Code. The third section would include summaries of other major University policies, such as fringe benefits and Computer Systems Acceptable Use, policies that are regularly updated or altered. Only the "Faculty Handbook" section would be printed and distributed. The entire "Faculty

Manual” would be posted online. Sections one and three will not be printed because of expense and because they will become outdated at a rapid pace.

Professor Davis added that the goal is to include in Section 2, the Faculty Handbook, only that which is legally binding and cannot be changed without an extensive adoption process that includes the Faculty Senate.

It was suggested that the recommendations that were put forth by a prior committee, chaired by Professor Witek, be considered in the new revisions. Professor Arend replied that the current committee does have copies of those recommendations, and they will be considered.

A discussion ensued about the appropriate section for issues such as fringe benefits, tuition benefits, parental leave policies, and faculty leave/sabbatical policies. Professor Arend noted that the Faculty Handbook ultimately must be approved by the Board of Directors

A motion was put forward that it is the sense of the Faculty Senate that the Governance Committee should proceed in this fashion (as described by Professor Arend). The motion passed unanimously. Professor Davis suggested that senators consider what items should be in the contractual and informational portions, and send thoughts on the subject to Professor Arend.

Professor Maggie Little presented the draft report of the Family Care and Maternity Leave Task Force, which was developed with the help of Professor Susan Deller Ross, a national expert on family leave policy. The current policy includes six to eight weeks of paid disability leave for ordinary faculty who give birth. Ordinary faculty who have a child join the family through birth or adoption may take up to four months of family care leave, either through full-time leave at no pay or half-time leave at half-time pay. They may also request an extension of the tenure clock for one year.

Professor Little suggested that there are problems with the current policy. The first problem is a lack of understanding of the policy. A second problem is that the policy is not being applied uniformly. A third problem is that the policy is out-dated. It does not provide adequate support to parents, and women faculty are disproportionately affected. The AAUP notes that women do not advance at the same pace as men when they begin having children as junior faculty. There is also a desire for a deeper commitment to paternity leave for caregiving.

The following recommendations for the Main and Law campuses were offered by the Task Force: educate current and newly-appointed chairs and deans, as well as assistant and associate deans on the policy and on the need for sensitivity; appoint a faculty member within each campus to serve as Parental Leave Liaison; regularize administration of childbirth and caretaking leave; create a pool of money within each campus to fund replacements for departments that have faculty taking childbirth and caretaking leave.

A significant additional recommendation involves giving paid parental caretaking leave, to be used within one year after the arrival of the child, for any father or mother who is a primary or coequal caregiver. This policy would be relatively inexpensive. For birth mothers, it could be taken either concurrently with or subsequent to short-term disability leave.

The discussion that ensued touched on issues such as the policy's potential effects upon students, its applicability to non-tenure-track long-term contract professors, the need (or lack of need) for a faculty liaison, the enforceability of the requirement of at least co-equal caregiving, other potential abuses of the policy, and the positive message that the policy would send to students that one can build a career in academia and still have a family.

As currently formulated this proposed policy is meant to apply to only the Main Campus and Law School faculty. The Medical School runs on a different calendar, and may have different needs. However, one senator suggested that it sets a bad precedent to implement a benefit that applies to some faculty but not others.

Concern was expressed with the timing of a recommendation to the Board of Directors, as some were hoping to complete this process before the fall semester begins. It cannot be brought to the May Board meeting because the Senate first needs to approve the new policy after the Medical Center Caucus reviews it. Professor Haramati said that the policy should be able to be taken up at the May 1 meeting of the Medical Center Caucus.

A motion was made that the Senate endorses the principle of the Task Force proposal, and encourages the committee to work with the Medical Center Caucus to adapt it to the needs of the Medical Center, and to re-consider the paragraph about the faculty liaison in light of today's discussion. The motion passed unanimously, with at least one abstention.

Ms. Ardoth Hassler, UIS Associate Vice President, provided an update on University Information Security. She introduced Mr. Brian Reilly, the new University Information Security Officer. They mentioned several IT security issues at other universities that have made the news in recent months, and noted that the GU network gets attacked many times every day.

Ms. Hassler suggested that if faculty receive pornography by email, they delete the message and take no further administrative steps. If they receive child pornography, however, they should contact the legal office.

The National Strategy to Secure Cyberspace has named higher education as a critical sector of the national infrastructure, and as such it must demonstrate strong baseline security or else face federal repercussions. In response to these security needs, Georgetown hired Brian Reilly for as our Information Security Officer and has developed a University Information Security Policy with input from students, faculty and administration from all three campuses. [An Executive Summary of this policy was distributed to the Senators.] According to this policy, the Registrars of the University are the stewards of student data. Faculty are the stewards of their research and course material. Students are the stewards of their own work. The bottom line is that everyone is responsible for protecting information resources to which they have access.

Ms. Hassler and Mr. Reilly answered many IT questions from senators, touching on topics such as the importance of good passwords, annoying pop-up advertisements, dial-up access, and spam.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:20 pm.