

**Minutes of the Meeting
Arts and Sciences Faculty
March 24, 2005**

Members Present: M. Anderson; B. Balak; G. Barreneche, P. Bernal; E. Blossy; A. Blumenthal; W. Boles; R. Bommelje, D. Boniface; A. Carpan; B. Carson; R. Carson; R. Casey; D. Charles; G. Child; R. Cowan; D. Crozier; D. Cummings; D. Davison; J. Davison; N. Decker; L. Duncan; S. Easton; H. Edge; L. Eng-Wilmot; R. Foglesong; J. Gorman; E. Gottlieb; Y. Greenberg; E. Gregory; D. Griffin; M. Gunter; D. Hargrove; P. Harris; J. Henton; J. Houston; G. Howell; C. Hudspeth; M. Hunt; P. Jarnigan; J. Johnson; D. Y. Jones; S. Klemann; M. Kovarik; S. Lackman; T. Lairson; P. Lancaster; C. Lauer; B. Levis; S. Libby; L. Lines; D. Mays; E. McClellan; G. Meyers; A. Moe; R. Moore; T. Moore; S. Neilson; R. Newcomb; A. Nordstrom; K. Norsworthy; M. O'Sullivan; T. Ouellette; T. Papay; S. Phelan; J. Provost; J. Queen; R. Ray; D. Rogers; M. Shafe; J. Shivamoggi; C. Skelly; R. Smither; P. Stephenson; W. Svitavsky; K. Taylor; M. Throumoulos; L. Tillman-Healy; R. Vitray; D. Wellman; Y. And. Yao; W. Zhang.

Guest: S. Agee; S. Carrier; S. Fischer. SGA: C. Cardinell; J. Coker; L. Ervin; Y. Galdón; A. Letanosky; C. McConnell; M. Mulling; P. Neinken;

I. Call to Order: Yehudit Greenberg called the meeting to order at 12:40 p.m.

II. Approval of the Minutes: The minutes from the February 24, 2005, meeting were approved as distributed.

III. Announcements:

A. Cherrie Ramirez (Junior) won the Goldwater Fellowship for the second time.

B. Colloquium this afternoon, "Course and Instructional Evaluation Forms," 3:30 p.m., Faculty Club.

C. QEP and SACS Visit (T. Lairson) – QEP is finished, and is available for downloading. Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday of next week (March 3-31, April 1). Faculty is encouraged to review the QEP in order to answer questions. The QEP is an aspirational document; it is focused on improving the campus environment and so improve learning on the campus. There are five initiatives: Leadership and Citizenship; Student Recruitment and Retention; Academic and Social Integrity; Internationalization; Diversity.

D. Long-Range I.T. Master Plan (D. Griffin) – The Finance and Service Committee sent the plan on to the administration for ultimate approval at the Presidential level.

IV. Honor Code (P. Bernal) – Greenberg reviewed the discussions and efforts that led to the plan being presented today. Bernal presented both the complete plan (in writing), a summary sheet (in writing), and a PowerPoint presentation.

After the Task Force was formed, the College became members of the Duke Center for Academic Integrity. Bernal went through the process. The Honor Code was passed by the SGA last night, with one amendment that will be discussed later. Bernal outlined the salient facts of

the Code. The Code does not mandate that faculty does not proctor exams, but the Student Life committee believes that it might be a good idea to not be looking over the students' shoulders. There are minor changes in language made since publication to the faculty of the current proposal. Following the presentation Bernal moved that the Honor Code be accepted. Balak seconded the motion.

An SGA resolution requesting that the identity of the accuser remains unknown to the accused was proposed. The faculty committee is not in favor of the spirit of this resolution. B. Carson commended the committee and students; there was unanimous applause in support. Nienken spoke to the student amendment; S. Nielsen also voiced support of the SGA resolution because of the impact on the students. The accused, in this situation, does not necessarily need to confront his/her accuser because this is a contract, and not a Constitutional issue. Bernal and O'Sullivan spoke in favor of allowing the accused to confront the accuser. O'Sullivan said there should be a culture of telling the truth. Chrissy Cardinell spoke in favor of the SGA proposal. Tillmann-Healy is concerned that while we are not a court of law, we are enacting procedures that presume guilt and restrict the rights of the accused. The accused has no right to an attorney and no inherent right to cross-examine witnesses. Decisions of guilt do not have to be unanimous, and the standard of evidence is low: "whether it is more likely than not that the accused student violated the Academic Honor Code." Levis proposed adoption of this resolution with a sunset clause, which was accepted as a friendly amendment by the student representatives from the SGA. Klemann asked whether there will be the chance to bring a frivolous charge. The accused does not know who the accuser is, but the council and the Dean would; therefore, the accuser is not anonymous. Griffin agreed with the sunset clause, of perhaps less than three years; he acknowledges that in the beginning students will be hesitant to report violations. Griffin also noted that a false accusation is, in itself, a violation of the honor code. D. Rogers agreed with the Levis proposal as well; he has read that, in Florida law, acts of retaliation equal complaints. Kypraios said the students must have ownership of the Code. Matt Mulling argued that this Code be student-owned, which would be greater with the resolution intact. Norsworthy noted this resolution is an eloquent statement about the current culture. A student R.A. spoke to frequent incidents of retaliation for reporting any other student for damage or other infraction in the residence halls. SGA representatives agreed that the proposal with a sunset clause was agreeable. Stephenson was incredulous that we would believe that a witness will remain anonymous; this is not a system of citizen of the community, and not a "snitch" policy. Decker gave an example of her son's experience as RA, and noted that this code was to tie together Academic as well as Social Honor that percolate from this new Code. B. Carson moved approval the SGA proposal with the amendment that the proposal will be reexamined in three years. There were several seconds to the motion in order to discuss this option.

Greenberg called on R. Foglesong to explain the procedure about calling the question, but there was not a 2/3 majority for calling the question. Levis proposed that the clauses from SGA to be terminated in three years. Bernal said that the phase-in of the Honor Code will counter the acceptance of the Code. He believes a phase-in period delays the process of changing the environment of the campus. Balak pointed out that doing the right thing is costly, but that students should be protected. Shafe said that if this Honor Code is passed it will affect the culture of the entire school.

The amendment for termination of the SGA proposal was defeated.

The amendment for reevaluation of the SGA proposal after three years was defeated.

Casey spoke to the imperative to launch this program now. If we do not act now, we will not have time to establish the process in the fall. B. Carson moved to consider the SGA amendment as it stands. Foglesong proposed that the issue be tabled until the next meeting. The motion to table was passed 31-23 until the next meeting.

V. Meeting adjourned at 1:57 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Cohn Lackman, Ph.D., M.B.A.
Vice-President/Secretary