

Minutes of FEC-9 Meeting

Wednesday, January 23, 2008, 9:30 - 11:00 a.m. Scribner Library 437

Present: Lisa Aronson (Scribe), Sue Bender, Una Bray, John Brueggemann, Dan Curley (Chair), Mark Huibregtse, Mehmet Odekon, Viviana Rangil, Mason Stokes

I. Minutes of 12-07-09 approved.

II. Discussion of IPPC business. Mark reported that the Budget and Finance Subcommittee has met; there are lots of budgetary parameters in play. A financial aid crunch might affect our ability to maintain our standards for attracting a diverse class next year. Mike West will present the budget parameters at the next IPPC meeting.

III. Discussion of Handbook Part Six issues.

The following are suggested changes, or questions raised:

- p. 604 Under Policy on Anti-Harassment – “Staff” should be clarified
- p. 605 Mark wishes for clarification on “All the policies.”
- p. 609 Bottom paragraph should read “staff member” instead of “staff.”
- p. 610 Need for a definition of “discrimination.”
- p. 614 3rd paragraph – on discussion of advisory panel, change “establish” to “constitute”
- p. 614 part E When a faculty member IS FORMALLY accused...
At bottom of paragraph, reword to read: “either the complainant or the respondent OR BOTH (REWORD)
- pp. 615-16 Above Legal Review – Faculty involvement will be a concern.
- p. 618 False Allegations – what is meant by “disciplinary action” – maybe say it is “harassment itself” and process should proceed accordingly.

FEC discussed whether that Report should be AP’s, not ADEWD, and questions whether or not ADEWD should chair AP, or in even be a member of AP? Una feels that ADEWD should be advisory.

What if faculty feel their rights have been violated after it has gone to President? Should they be able to go to CAFR, and should the latter have access to the documentation?

On the question of the Administrative Review, who has the final say; who comes up with summary, findings, training?

Because of these unresolved issues, Sue suggested that we present at end of February meeting, to be voted on March meeting.

Mehmet raised question - Does this document belong in the Faculty Handbook?

Mark asks "What does faculty vote mean?" Do we really have a say in procedure?

Una asks, do they have a statement of exactly what harassment is according to NY State definition?

FEC looking for clarification on training. What does it entail?

IV. FEC agreed with Susan Kress' suggestion that Tom O'Connell be asked to replace Roy Meyers, who has resigned from IRC, citing health issues.

V. Zankel Working Group. FEC feels that the at-large faculty member be someone in computers, or, at the very least, someone far afield from the art world. FEC will issue willingness to serve.

VI. FEC looked briefly at suggestions Alice Dean (who has chaired Pat Oles' review) gave for fine-tuning the review process. FEC asked why her points #2 and #3 are helpful? Dan asked that we read it over, and get back to him.

Respected Submitted,

Lisa Aronson