MINUTES OF THE GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
Thursday, September 17, 2015, 4:00PM
ICC 103
(approved October 13, 2015)

PRESENT: Berlinerblau, Bisenbach-Lucas, Boettcher, Bronstein, Calvert, Davis, Danielsen, DeFina, Donohue, Ecelbarger, Eshkevari, Ann Fleming, Gentic, Gewanter, Gillis, Glazer, Groves, Harbert, Hinkson, Iglarsh, Jensen, Kaltman, Kamrad, Kertesz, Krim, LaRocque, Luta, Marhanka, McCartin, Moran-Cruz, Mulroney, Olesko, Otter, Parsons, Pellathy (by phone), Pfeiffer, Roshwald, Saunders (by phone), Scott, Shaw, Steenhuisen, J. Turner

ABSENT: Abusharaf, Anderko, Arend, Bloch, Byrne, Cohn, Colie, Connor-Linton, Cumby, Diamond, Djakiew, Dutton, Engler, Ernst, Evangelista, Feinerman, Goldfrank, Harris, Healton, Hyams, Lamm, Leister, Lieber, Marquez, McCabe, Mezey, Montgomery, Moore, Natarajan, Ross, Sadowska, Salles-Reese, Sandberg, Santos, Sheppard, Singer, Sonbol, Tercyak, Thomas, Treanor, S. Turner, Vroman (on leave, fall 2015), Withy, Young

GUESTS: Tom Beauchamp (Chair, Faculty Responsibilities Task Force; Professor, Philosophy), BethAnn Bergsmark (Interim Deputy CIO, UIS), Donna DeLay (UIS Associate Director), Miriam Toporowicz (Assistant Professor, Pediatrics), Judd Nicholson (Interim VP, UIS and CIO)

The meeting was called to order by Wayne Davis at 4:03 p.m.

Approval of Minutes

Motion #1: The minutes of May 13th, 2015 were approved with the following votes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aye</th>
<th>Nay</th>
<th>Abstain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Changes to the Help Desk (Judd Nicholson, Interim VP, UIS)

Judd Nicholson was joined by Beth Ann Bergsmark and Donna DeLay. Judd Nicholson provided an overview of UIS Faculty support and updates in their operation approaches since presenting to Faculty Senate last spring. The updates and changes include:

- Responding to Faculty Support survey and focus groups.
- Adjusting their service model to supply on-campus faculty support (as of October 5). Hours of operation will be M-F 9-5 p.m. Calling the Help Desk at 7-4949 will include an option for faculty to contact direct support. Support staff will be physically located in STM G31, with a satellite team in Lauinger Library.

Discussion opened to floor and concerns/comments included:

- Moving the UIS support platform to Dell. Would Mac still be supported? Answer: Macs will still be supported. All other equipment delivered will still be supported.
- Monitoring the needs at night (for example after-hours adjunct). UIS data from Blackboard services suggests that majority during office hours.
- Computer replacement cycle: every 4 years and department pays (for Main Campus)
- Concerns about weekend emergency: call Help Desk (7-4949) and tell them it's the emergency and the call will escalate to those trained to help.

Confirmation of Appointments: Steering Committee

The list of 2015-2016 Senate Steering Committee members was circulated. Move to approve all appointments across the board. The motion was approved with the following votes:

Motion #2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aye</th>
<th>Nay</th>
<th>Abstain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Confirmation of Appointments: University Committees

A list of vacant committee positions was circulated, including Graduate School Executive Committee (George Luta), Main campus Speech and Expression Committee (Josh Mitchell), Main Campus Performing Arts Advisory Council (Collier Hyams), Research Integrity Committee (TBD), Medical Center Admissions Committee (TBD), Main Campus Research Advisory Committee (Bill Gormley if he is willing).

Move was made to approve all appointments and conditional appointees across the board. The motion was approved with the following votes:

Motion #3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aye</th>
<th>Nay</th>
<th>Abstain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lauve Steenhuisen (Theology) said that she would be presenting proposals at the October meeting concerning Non-Tenure Line Faculty.

**Beginning Discussion of the Faculty Responsibility Code**

The proposed Code was presented by Wayne Davis, Tom Beauchamp (chair, Faculty Responsibilities Task Force). Input was provided by Lisa Krim.

Tom provided the history of the Task Force, including: 2012 appointment of Task Force members by DeGioia in 2012 at the request of the Senate; a full working draft completed by 2013; feedback provided by over 30 faculty and administrators representing all Schools; work with Senate Steering Committee during 2014-15 culminating in the current proposal dated 08-30-15, which was approved by both the Task Force and the Steering Committee.

Wayne provided the rationale for the Task Force, including the lack of process in the Faculty Handbook in the case that faculty do not uphold their Responsibilities as listed in the current Faculty Handbook. The Faculty Responsibilities Committee: Policies and Procedures is intended to be included in the Faculty Handbook and will serve to protect faculty accused of misconduct and to protect those impacted by misconduct of faculty. The Task Force proposed that the committee would be comprised of 17 tenured faculty member, 9 from Main Campus, 4 from Medical Center, 4 from Law Center.

Discussion opened to floor and concerns/comments included:

- **What is the next step in the process?** Response: Senate deliberates until they agree on a revision and approves it, then sent to all faculty members for review, allowing time to comment. Senate then reconvenes and adds or changes if necessary. Senate then sends to President and Board of Directors for approval. This process is standard for all Faculty Handbook revisions.
- **Susan Mulroney (GUMC) raised concerned about the responsibility of Unit head to document misconduct.** Response: Faculty Responsibilities Committee can see the charge directly, without the Unit Head to evaluate. Lisa Krim agrees that training of Unit Heads is necessary to enable this process, despite the differences between themselves
- **Concerns about the term “Misconduct” because of the breadth of cases (i.e., is the word choice too harsh?)** Response: The task force spent time deliberating the term, yet accepted it as is, with the understanding that within this term, there is a range.
- **Discussion concerning illegal activities. Will illegal activities still require the misconduct process?** In the case of this Code, if the University takes no action against the accused faculty member until the process is complete, the faculty member would have no basis for filing a lawsuit against the University. Criminal investigations and charges against the faculty member would be carried out by District or Federal government, and could proceed independent of the University’s process.
- **Questions were raised about clause saying that this process would apply only to issues “not handled through merit review and related reviews established in individual units of the university.”** The answer was that this Code would not supersede the policies whereby salary increases are based on faculty performance, but might be invoke if low salary increase awards did not lead to the faculty member fulfilling his or her responsibilities in subsequent years.
• How does this process intersect with Research Integrity Process? Lisa Krim agrees this needs to be spelled out along the lines of what is said about IDEAA.

• OMBUDS vs. Faculty Misconduct Committee. What is the overlap or intersection? Response: OMBUDS should come initially. OMBUDS cases are usually faculty with a grievance of an administrative assistant. OMBUDS can advise on how to follow this process and work with the Faculty Responsibilities Committee. Also OMBUDS only a Main Campus office.

• A question was raised about what would happen if a Panel investigating a Formal Charge uncovered evidence of Misconduct not mentioned in the Charge? Could the Panel pursue it? Could the Panel refer the evidence to the Dean? Would the latter violate the Confidentiality Clause? There was agreement these questions need to be addressed

• What is the definition of “serious”? The Task Force and Steering Committee discussed at length whether this term could be defined in a way that would be helpful. They decided that the question of whether an alleged failure was serious should be left to the judgment of the Faculty Responsibility Committee.

The discussion continued and Wayne Davis asked for additional input to be directed to him or Tom Beauchamp, chair of the Task Force.

Motion #4: To adjourn:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aye</th>
<th>Nay</th>
<th>Abstain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The meeting was adjourned at 6:01 p.m.
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