

Agenda
Faculty of Arts and Sciences
Wednesday, 7 May 2003
12:00 p.m. in the Galloway Room
(following lunch)

I. Call to Order

II. Announcements

III. Approval of the minutes of the meeting 24 April 2003 of the faculty

IV. Ratification of FEC

The Executive committee has named Maurice O'Sullivan for a full three-year position and Bob Sherry to a one-year alternate position for FEC. One additional name will be presented at the faculty meeting. Faculty confirmation of this slate is required by the Bylaws.

V. Election to fill Vacancy on AAC

VI. New Business

A. Student Judicial Task Force

Resolution on Faculty Participation in Student Judicial Hearings: Given that the vast majority (~ 90%) of judicial cases are being considered in administrative hearings, we recommend that four faculty members be appointed to participate, in a rotating basis, in administrative hearings that will be conducted at set times to facilitate faculty participation. Although it is recognized that cases requiring immediate attention will arise and that the system will have to be flexible so as not to unduly interfere with the work of administrative judicial officers, the presumption shall be that faculty members will be present when administrative decisions are made. The Student Life Committee will be responsible for submitting the names of four faculty members to the Executive Committee for approval.

This proposed arrangement should be reviewed in two years. Faculty members should be appointed for a period of two years

(Report of the Task Force addendum 1)

B. Faculty Member Resolution (Don Griffin)

VII. Reports

- A. Underwater Endowment (George Herbst)
- B. The State of the College (Jim Malek, Jim Eck)

VIII. Adjournment

Addendum 1

Task Force Report

Members of the Judicial Taskforce: Pedro Bernal, Lee Lines, Alisa Rosenthal, and Judy Provost

1. Charge:

Our **task** was to **examine** the state of the Judicial System and come up with recommendations **on** how best to enshrine faculty representation in that system.

2. Process:

The Task Group took the following steps:

1. We met to discuss information to be gathered and the processes to be employed.
2. We requested, received and reviewed data from Ken Posner for the past two years of Judicial Board actions.
3. We interviewed as a group Ken Posner, Christine Carr, and Steve Neilson.
4. We interviewed the director of Campus Safety; Brad McKown

3. The State of the System:

This system is detailed and comprehensive and has been developed over many years, based on the Student Affairs professionals' expertise and examination of other colleges' judicial systems.

We have concluded that sanctions are consistently administered. There are occasional “adjustments” of sanctions for compelling circumstances, such as postponing removing a student from a residence hall until the end of the term if the sanction was given close to the end of the term.

Dean Neilson reports no undue pressure to reverse decisions and says he has “never” reversed a judicial sanction.

The biggest issue in ensuring the success of this system is reporting, so that problems get addressed through the Judicial System. Some dissatisfaction with the quality of referrals from Campus Safety was expressed.

In our meetings, a number of faculty members were interested in the rationale for the existence of a separate Greek Board. As it turns out, the Greek Board has considered two cases in the last five years. The nature of the system we have now is one in which the vast majority of the cases are being considered in administrative hearings (97% and 84% in the last two years).

Campus Safety does not see a problem in having a different reporting line than the Judicial Board and describes a collaborative approach. The Task Group questions whether there may be some difficulty in consistent application of the system and communications because of these differing reporting lines.

4. Recommendations:

The current model, now being implemented, may be the best way to enshrine representation of the faculty in the Judicial System. Four faculty members, on a rotating basis, are attending the Community Board Hearings. Faculty representation in the administrative hearings is a much more difficult task because these hearings are the day-to-day work of the judicial staff and not actually a Board. The current model in which a faculty member, Thomas Moore, is being kept informed on the proceedings may be the only way for faculty to participate, given that any other involvement may require too much time.

In conclusion, the Judicial System is not perfect but the campus social problems that led to the creation of this task group would be there even if the system were perfect. In other words, the problems with the social climate on campus are not directly attributable to the judicial system. Thus, we recommend that the faculty not focus on a redesign of the current judicial process as a means of addressing the broader campus social issues. Instead, we are of the view that campus structures, procedures, and expenditures of resources should more accurately reflect the priorities of the campus community. This requires a process in which those priorities are clearly identified and

articulated. Once these priorities are clarified, we will be in a better position to identify the changes necessary to address the problems of social life on campus.