

Deans Council Minutes
November 5, 2012
3:30 PM
339 McCool

Members Present: Jerry Gilbert (chair), Richard Blackbourn, Steven Brown, Tim Chamblee, Frances Coleman, Lou D'Abramo, Greg Dunaway, Jerry Emison, Robert Coopert (for Kent Hoblet), Julia Hodges, George Hopper, Joan Lucas, Sharon Oswald, Mike Rackley, Donna Reese (for Sarah Rajala), Lynn Reinschmiedt, Peter Ryan, Seth Oppenheimer (for Chris Snyder), Jim West, Park Wynn.

Others Present: Randy Follett, Teresa Gammill, Mitzy Johnson, Bill Kibler, Meghan Millea, James Orr, Scott Roberts, Judy Spencer, Steve Taylor.

Minutes Taken By: Martha Thomas.

1. Upon a motion by Frances Coleman and second by Jim West, the minutes of the October 15, 2012, meeting were approved unanimously with no corrections.
2. Announcements:
 - a. Jerry Gilbert thanked Sharon Oswald for allowing the use of 339 McCool for this meeting.
 - b. Dr. Gilbert announced that the search committee for the position of Registrar plans to have their recommendations to Dr. Gilbert this week. The search committee for the Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences has been finalized and the search committees for the Dean and Associate Vice President of the Graduate School and the Executive Director of the Center for Distance Education are nearly finalized.
 - c. Dr. Gilbert reminded the deans that they should have a regular schedule of third-year reviews of department heads. Dr. Gilbert requested that the deans send a schedule of these reviews to him.
 - d. Dr. Gilbert reminded the deans that the university does not provide extra payment to department heads for any purpose.
 - e. Dr. Gilbert reminded the Deans Council of the following upcoming deadlines:
 - i. Irvin Atley Jefcoat Excellence in Advising Award Applications – due December 14
 - ii. Honorary Degree Nominations – due January 11
 - iii. Giles Distinguished Professor Nominations – due February 25
3. Academic Operating Policies:
 - a. AOP 12.07 – Student Honor Code Policy:
 - i. Peter Ryan stated that this document has undergone many revisions since the original draft.
 - ii. Sharon Oswald discussed the most recent edits to the AOP, including allowing the College of Veterinary Medicine process to remain the same for its professional students, requiring graduate students involved in academic misconduct to follow the same type of process as undergraduate students (but with a university-wide council hearing consisting of graduate students and graduate faculty), and edits to the appeal process.
 - iii. There was discussion as to why graduate students would be treated differently than undergraduate students (as it relates to this policy) in terms of sanctions.

- iv. There was discussion regarding the wording of the appeal process related to graduate students.
- v. **Tim Chamblee moved that the current draft of the AOP be sent back to Scott Roberts' committee that developed the Student Honor Code Policy to weigh-in on these changes and re-examine the AOP for consistency. Dr. Oswald seconded the motion. Jerry Emison added that the committee be made aware that the current draft of the AOP may not necessarily reflect the views of the Deans Council and that the committee would have the latitude to assess the appropriateness of the current AOP.**
 - 1. Discussion:
 - a. Bill Kibler stated that the second offense due process needs to be addressed – if the dean is the decision-maker, the student must be permitted to appear before the dean to appeal the decision.
 - b. Dr. Roberts stated that the current draft of the AOP has changed some procedural and philosophical underpinnings of the Student Honor Code.
 - c. There was discussion as to whether a committee considering an appeal would overturn the decision of the dean.
 - d. Dr. Roberts stated that General Counsel had not seen a problem with holding graduate students to a higher standard than undergraduate students.
 - e. Dr. Oswald opined that graduate students should be held to a higher standard but not automatically expelled on their first offense; rather, there should be some flexibility in sanctions depending on factors related to each case.
 - f. Dr. Roberts stated that the changes would not go in effect until training on plagiarism and academic misconduct was available for graduate students.
 - g. Seth Oppenheimer suggested having the same procedure for each student with different sanctions based upon status (for example, undergraduate versus graduate).
 - vi. **The motion was approved unanimously.**
- b. AOP 13.07 – Academic Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures:
 - i. Dr. Ryan stated that the Deans Council is not considering the document which governs promotion and tenure; that the promotion and tenure process will follow the guidelines found in Section V of the Faculty Handbook.
 - ii. **George Hopper made a motion that the AOP be approved as presented. Dr. D'Abramo seconded the motion.**
 - 1. Discussion:
 - a. Greg Dunaway suggested that there be consistency with other items (for example, post-tenure review). Meghan Millea stated that post-tenure review is

governed by an Operating Policy and that it may be warranted to convert this OP to an AOP.

- b. There was discussion as to whether the Faculty Handbook was a policy. Dr. Millea stated that it was not a policy.
- c. Dr. Gilbert stated that all universities have a Faculty Handbook and that most are not designated as a policy but are treated as such.
- d. Dr. Oppenheimer asked which document would have legal precedence in a lawsuit. Joan Lucas responded that a policy would. Dr. Gilbert stated that if there is a conflict between a policy and the Faculty Handbook that the policy would rule; however, if there is not a policy governing a topic, the stand-alone procedures would rule in place of a policy.
- e. The purpose of eliminating the procedures from the AOP is to eliminate the opportunity for inconsistency between the AOP and the Faculty Handbook.
- f. Ms. Lucas suggested adding a link to the Faculty Handbook on the Internal Audit website where policies are housed.
- g. There was one suggested edit to the AOP: adding to the AOP a hyperlink to the Faculty Handbook.

2. The motion was approved unanimously with the above edit.

4. Faculty Handbook:

- a. Dr. Millea explained that the Faculty Handbook had been previously updated in 1999 and that substantive changes had been made. She stated that the Faculty Handbook had been approved by President Keenum.
- b. Dr. Millea pointed out several aspects of the document, including: principles for university governance, evaluation of administrators and faculty, search committee expectations, the Academic Department Heads Executive Committee, and a change to majority required for amendments.
- c. There were concerns expressed regarding the language governing search committee expectations as it relates to assistant and associate deans.
- d. Dr. Millea asked that any proposed edits be sent in a letter to the Faculty Senate and that the purpose of bringing the Faculty Handbook to Deans Council today was for information sharing only. Dr. Millea stated that the Faculty Handbook is reviewed and approved by the Faculty Senate, Provost and Executive Vice President, and President.

5. Institutional Effectiveness Reports:

- a. Dr. Chamblee stated that his office had found that institutional effectiveness (IE) reports had not been done by the academic colleges. To assist in this process, the Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness (OIRE) has drafted IE reports for each of the colleges based on the information shared in the annual presentations.
- b. Mitzy Johnson distributed a report to each of the colleges and asked that the deans contact OIRE to schedule a time to review these reports and

make any edits. Ms. Johnson stated that the colleges should feel free to make any changes they wish.