

## UNL FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES

December 3, 2019

City Campus Union, Presidents Kevin Hanrahan and Sarah Purcell, Presiding

### 1.0 Call to Order

President Hanrahan called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

### 2.0 Chancellor Green

Chancellor Green noted that we are approaching the December commencement with over 1400 students graduating, and we may be on track to equal, or possibly surpass, last year's record-breaking number of graduates for the academic year. He pointed out that Professor Kwame Dawes, English, will be the Commencement speaker at the December undergraduate ceremony.

Chancellor Green reported that last month Nebraska Research Days, formerly known as the Research Fair, celebrated and highlighted the impacts of Nebraska's research community. He stated that this year we saw significant increases in research funding with total research expenditures reaching \$320 million. He reported that this has also been a record year for patents and licenses, noting that last year we had 22 patents, and this year we already have 30, ranking us as 79<sup>th</sup> in the world for all universities.

In addition to those research efforts, Chancellor Green, pointed out that three of our faculty members: Professor Ed Cahoon, Professor Tom Clemente, and Professor Eileen Hebets, have been selected as fellows of the American Association for the Advancement of Science which is the world's largest and most prestigious general scientific society. He stated that they will receive the award in February at the AAAS convention.

Chancellor Green reported that Professor Francisco Souto was recently selected for the "State of the Art 2020" national contemporary art exhibition, and recently received the Lorenzo il Magnifico Award for his works on paper at the XIIth edition of the Florence Biennale of Contemporary Art in Italy. Chancellor Green stated that we are in the process of commissioning Professor Souto to create some work for UNL.

Chancellor Green stated that we have made major progress this fall on a number of items. He reported that we are very close to having the final draft of the N2025 strategic plan, and the four co-chairs of the plan have been busy speaking to the colleges and departments to gather feedback. He stated that the N2025 team is now developing the targets for the plan, and he anticipates that the Executive Leadership Team will review the plan over the holidays. He noted that the Academic Planning Committee will review the final draft in January, and the intention is to roll the plan out in February with the State of the University address.

Chancellor Green reported that the budget model development has continued to progress and is on schedule. He noted that the trial year for the budget model will begin in July 2020.

Chancellor Green announced that the proposed revisions to the Bylaws, suggested by the Faculty Senate, are now under discussion at Central Administration. He stated that he, Interim EVC Moberly, and Associate Vice Chancellor Walker will be meeting with Interim President Fritz, Interim Provost Jackson, and VP Legal Jim Pottorff to discuss the revisions. He noted that the UNL Senate has been working with the other campuses to have them to consider and approve the proposed changes.

Chancellor Green stated that he plans to make the announcements next week regarding the appointment of a new EVC. He noted that he is very pleased that the candidate accepted our offer, and he thinks she will be an excellent EVC.

Chancellor Green pointed out that four candidates will be interviewed for the Dean of the College of Journalism and Mass Communications, and he is looking forward to having a new Dean in place for the college in 2020.

Chancellor Green reported that he is looking for a new Faculty Athletics Representative. He noted that this person is a liaison between the campus and the NCAA and works with the academic side of the University. He stated that Professor Potuto has served admirably in the role since 1997, however, the standard appointment at most NCAA institutions is for five years or less. He stated that applications for a five-year appointment are due December 12<sup>th</sup>. He noted that the campus is also in the process of launching the search for the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, but the search will probably not become active until after January 1.

Chancellor Green reported that the Board of Regents are scheduled to meet on December 5<sup>th</sup> to decide on the appointment of Ret. Admiral Ted Carter as the new NU President. He stated that he is aware of the local AAUP's concerns about the appointment, but from his interactions with Ret. Admiral Carter, he believes Ret. Admiral Carter will be exceptional and will do great things for the University system.

Chancellor Green reported that several building projects are occurring on campus. He pointed out that the CYT Library now looks quite different after being completely gutted. He stated that the renovation project is now on schedule. He noted that the fencing is now up around Engineering and the Link will soon be demolished to make way for the Phase 1 project of the Scott Engineering Center. He reported that the East Campus Union dining facility is now open, and the rest of the Union is scheduled to be completed this coming spring. He stated that Hamilton Hall will have some renovations of organic chemistry labs, and Mabel Lee Hall will be demolished this spring. He stated that a project initiation request to renovate the library in Architecture Hall and to create additional studio space is moving forward as well as to improve the link of the building to the former Law building, for a cost of \$3 ½ million. He stated that the Veteran's Tribute will start construction in the spring in front of the Military & Naval Science and Sapp buildings. He pointed out that the funding for this project is from veterans and private donors. He reported that Phase II of the Engineering complex has been approved by the Board of Regents and 75% of the funding for the project has now been raised, and the next step will be to determine the construction company. He reported that over 50% of the fundraising for the Athletics facilities has been completed.

Chancellor Green stated that there are several buildings that are in the very early stages of planning, but at this time we do not know what these buildings would ultimately look like. He noted that the next 10-year University of Nebraska Foundation Comprehensive Campaign fundraising will begin in 2020 and will include fundraising for a number of additional facilities projects. These include the expansion of the Raikes School to accommodate more students which will require an additional dormitory, to renovate the fourth floor of Andrews Hall, and possibly a building to house the proposed new School of Computing. He reported that a new Ruth Staples Child Center is also being considered. He stated that the idea is to relocate the Center to the area previously located by graduate student housing on East Campus. He noted that the expansion of the Barkley Center is scheduled to be reviewed by the Board of Regents at the December 5<sup>th</sup> meeting, and the Westbrook Music Building is being looked at for a complete rebuild of the facility. He stated that the Lied Center is seeking \$20 million to renovate the front of the building, and a new Beadle II facility for the life sciences is being considered. He pointed out that we have outgrown the Beadle Center and additional teaching and research facilities are needed. He stated that the total cost of this project could be \$150 to \$200 million. Professor Woodman, School of Biological Sciences, asked if the Beadle II building would be on City or East campus. Chancellor Green stated that developing a Beadle II Center is part of long term planning, and it could be located on either of the campuses, or even on Nebraska Innovation Campus.

Chancellor Green noted that in one respect this has been a difficult year for UNL due to the particularly high loss of faculty members, both active and emeriti. He asked the Faculty Senate to keep in mind those departments and colleagues that have lost these faculty members, and he wanted to say thank you to those who have passed for what they have done to make the campus and university a better place: Alan Seagren, Educational Administration; Campbell McConnell, Economics; Al Williams, Sociology; Donald J. Nelson, Electrical Engineering; David Swanson, Holland Computer Center, Arts and Sciences; Elaine Nowick, University Libraries; Wieslaw Szydowski, Mechanical and Materials Engineering; Jack Schinstock, Biological Systems Engineering; Mary Bomberger Brown, School of Natural Resources; Michael Combs, Political Science; Cecilia Reiger Daly, Computer Science; Anthony Starace, Physics & Astronomy; John D. Turner, Classics and History; Robert Bruce Kaul, Botany; Foster G. Owen, Animal Science; Jim Alfano, Plant Pathology; Robert Rufford, Geology; and Marty Gardner, Law.

### **3.0 Announcements**

#### **3.1 Acknowledgement of Service of Professor Kwame Dawes**

President Hanrahan noted that with the upcoming appointment of Ret. Admiral Ted Carter as the next University of Nebraska President, he wanted to publically thank our esteemed colleague, Professor Kwame Dawes, English, for his work as serving on the President's search committee. The Faculty Senate then applauded Professor Dawes to acknowledge appreciation for his work on the search committee and for representing the UNL faculty.

#### **3.2 Proposed Revisions to Student Code of Conduct**

President Hanrahan reported that Central Administration has been working on revising the Student Code of Conduct so that it is a system-wide Code. He stated that the revised document has been shared with the Senate Presidents and he will be sharing it with the Senate Executive Committee. He noted that the Senate had approved revisions to the Code previously, but it will need to eventually approve further revisions.

#### **3.3 Faculty Athletic Representative**

President Hanrahan reported that anyone can apply for the Faculty Athletic Representative position and encouraged those that are interested to do so by the deadline date of December 12.

#### **3.4 Faculty Database**

President Hanrahan reported that the Committee on Committees is working on establishing a database of faculty members who would be interested in serving on a committee or taskforce.

#### **3.5 Peer Evaluation of Teaching Taskforce**

President Hanrahan reported that the EVC Office is forming a taskforce on Peer Evaluation of Teaching, and the Office is asking for two or three faculty members from each college to serve on the taskforce. He asked Senators to send him the names of faculty members who would be interested in serving.

#### **3.6 APLU's Aspire Institutional Change Network**

President Hanrahan stated that UNL has been chosen as part of the second cohort for the APLU's Aspire Institutional Change Network which strives to enhance STEM faculty recruitment, hiring, and retention practices. He reported that a team will be set up that will lead the efforts and the following faculty members are needed: a senior STEM faculty member, a recently promoted STEM faculty member, and an URG STEM faculty member. He asked that anyone interested, or if they know of potential team members, they should let him know.

### **4.0 Election of Executive Committee Member**

President Hanrahan reported that the other candidate has withdrawn their nomination making Professor Gay, Physics and Astronomy, the lone candidate. He asked if there were any nominations from the floor. Hearing none he stated that he would entertain a motion to elect Professor Gay by acclamation. Professor Dussault, Chemistry, made the motion to approve by

acclamation. The motion was seconded by Professor Adenwalla, Physics & Astronomy and approved by the Faculty Senate.

## **5.0 Approval of November 5, 2019 Faculty Senate Minutes**

President Hanrahan asked if there were any corrections to the November 5<sup>th</sup> minutes. Hearing none he asked for approval of the minutes. The minutes were approved by the Faculty Senate.

## **6.0 Committee Reports**

### **6.1 Research Council (Professor Reimer)**

Professor Reimer noted that this is her second year serving as Chair of the Council. She stated that the Council's responsibilities include advising the Vice Chancellor of the Office of Research and Economic Development on matters of research including UNL faculty proposals on federal grants, reviewing and awarding internal grants, and selecting speakers for the Nebraska Lectures series. She noted that the spring 2019 speaker was Professor Borstelmann from History, and the fall speaker was Professor Hebets from the School of Biological Sciences. She stated that the Council plans to continue evaluating the efficacy of the proposal review process to see if improvements are needed. She noted that the Council is getting familiar with NURamp and trying to make the review process clearer. She stated that the Council wants to improve research efforts at UNL and invites everyone to email her if they have suggestions for improvements.

Professor Reimer reported that the number of internal proposals last year were very low, with only 64 being submitted, but noted that available funding was lower this year. She stated that those who submitted proposals this fall will be notified soon on whether their application was approved. Professor Adenwalla asked why the Montgomery Lecture Funds vanished this year. Professor Reimer stated that she does not know why funding was not available this year, but she will ask ORED about it.

### **6.2 Student Conduct/Appeals Board (Assistant Vice Chancellor Johnson)**

Assistant VC Johnson reported that the Student Conduct Board/Appeals Board have both faculty and student representatives. He noted that three faculty members will be leaving the Board at the end of the semester and will need to be replaced.

Assistant VC Johnson stated that there was an increase in the number of cases that the Student Conduct Board heard this year with a total of 60. He noted that the Appeals Board heard one case. He stated that the increase may be the result of closer adherence to the Student Code of Conduct. He pointed out that if a student who violates the Code ignores the notice of violation from Student Conduct & Community Services, does not attend a meeting, or rejects a formal resolution addressing the violation, the student must go to the Board. He noted that many of the Board's hearings are related to students who have not responded or participated in addressing the violation(s).

Assistant VC Johnson stated that non-academic violations typically pertain to alcohol and drugs. He pointed out that in the report "violation of any federal, state, or local law" is listed and these incidents typically relate to disorderly houses. He noted that the University is concerned with the disorderly houses because they typically involve students and create significant problems for the neighborhoods. He reported that only of the cases listed in the report were academic integrity matters.

Professor Billesbach, Biological Systems Engineering, asked if the cases where there is a violation of state or local laws needs to be prosecuted by the authorities before the University takes action. Assistant VC Johnson stated that the University is notified by local law enforcement and then the University pursues the matter. Professor Billesbach asked how the University can get involved if the students have not been charged with a violation. Assistant VC Johnson stated that the University will work with the student in an informal manner to address the problem.

President Hanrahan noted that there were many alcohol violations and asked if there are any programs or plans to address this problem on campus. Assistant VC Johnson reported that there are programs to help educate students about abuse, one of which is called Step UP. He stated that the new programs stress prevention but attempts to intervene can be made in order to try to stop the abusive behavior.

Professor Woodman, School of Biological Sciences, asked what happens when a student defaults and does not attend a meeting with the Board. Assistant VC Johnson stated that if the student does not appear, the Board evaluates the information that exists about the case and makes a decision based on its merits.

Professor Lindquist, Agronomy and Horticulture, noted that a resolution on Academic Integrity will be considered at today's meeting, and asked if Student Conduct & Community Standards supports the policy, and if approved, what will happen with the data that is obtained with reports of academic dishonesty. Assistant VC Johnson noted that our current Student Code of Conduct already embeds some policies on what the faculty should do with incidents of academic dishonesty, but he believes the Faculty Senate is an appropriate place for the policy to reside. He noted that the new Student Code of Conduct will have language that addresses these violations. He stated that the University has a database for managing these kinds of records, separate from academic records, and the Office of Student Affairs maintains the database. He pointed out that staff have to be given specific permission to have access, and this is a very limited number of people on our campus. He stated that the resolution seeks to make clear that the faculty member reporting the violation would be able to get information back on how the violation was handled by the Student Conduct Board. He stated that he is comfortable with the policy.

Professor Minter, English, noticed that none of the violations include Title IX violations. She asked if these violations are handled separately. Assistant VC Johnson stated that there were no hearings this year on sexual misconduct but members of the Board are trained to hear these matters.

Professor Izard, Food Science and Technology, asked about the status of the new Student Code of Conduct being developed at the system level. Assistant VC Johnson reported that the University system used the revised Code of Conduct developed by Professor Lenich, Law, and approved by the Faculty Senate, as a basis for the system-wide code, but there has been work from each of the campuses to further develop it. He noted that he served on a committee organized by the Office of General Counsel to look at the Code to make sure it is functional for all of the campuses. He stated that the newly revised Code has been shared with Faculty Senate Presidents, Student Body Presidents, and Student Regents and the goal is to have the new Code approved at the June 2020 meeting of the Board of Regents.

Professor Brown Kramer, Psychology, asked if there is a shield provision in the Student Code of Conduct that would protect a student if they brought in or reported another student who is drunk or has committed a violation. Assistant VC Johnson noted that a case of academic dishonesty would not be shielded, but in regards to drugs or alcohol abuse, if a student reports a medical emergency they are protected from disciplinary action, but the policy asks them to undergo alcohol education to hopefully reduce their risks. He pointed out that the new Code would more clearly explain how these situations are handled.

## **7.0 Unfinished Business**

### **7.1 Resolution to Approve a Policy on Sanctions Related to Academic Integrity**

President Hanrahan noted that the resolution was presented at last month's meeting and asked if there was any discussion on the proposed policy.

Professor Izard questioned whether it was too early to vote on the resolution given that the Student Code of Conduct is undergoing further revisions. He stated that he is concerned that the proposed policy would need further changes because it doesn't comply with the Code of Conduct. Professor

Dussault stated that the resolution was drafted because Professor Lenich, who worked with ASUN and the Faculty Senate to revise the Code, felt that the section pertaining to the faculty and academic dishonesty had been incorrectly added to the Student Code of Conduct. He stated that the Academic Integrity Committee has no evidence that the section would be reinserted and therefore the new Code will probably lack any policy addressing what faculty should do to address academic dishonesty. He pointed out that the proposed policy is separate because it addresses what the faculty needs to do to respond to acts of academic dishonesty.

Professor Woodman noted that the policy states that a faculty member must report an incident of academic dishonesty, even if no academic sanction is taken. He asked what would happen if a faculty member did not report an incident. Professor Dussault stated that the Academic Integrity Committee thinks that 75% of academic dishonesty cases are not reported, and the goal is to try to move towards a university with limited violations of academic dishonesty. He stated that one difference between current practices and this proposed policy is that faculty members should make a report if it is thought that there has been a violation of academic honesty. Previously a report was to be made if academic sanctions were taken.

Professor Woodman pointed out that the policy states that Student Conduct & Community Standards may share information about the outcome of a reported incident, but he prefers that the office must share the outcome with the faculty member. He stated that there should also be a time limit for when students can challenge a report of academic dishonesty. Professor Woodman moved to amend the language to read “must” instead of “may” in section G. Motion seconded by Professor Schwadel, Sociology.

Professor Brown Kramer noted that she teaches large semester course of 400 students and she estimates 30-40 students will plagiarize in some way. She stated that she would not be inclined to report each incident, but would report cases when a student shows no regret for the violation, and noted that she would not need to know the results of what happens when it is addressed by Student Conduct & Community Standards. Assistant VC Johnson stated that it would be difficult to determine when to report back to the faculty member or not. He pointed out that currently it is not clear who is or isn't authorized to report violations of the Code, but this policy corrects this by stating that reporting faculty are considered authorized persons. Professor Fenton, Northeast Research & Extension Center, moved to add the language “if requested”. President Hanrahan noted that an amendment to the amendment has been made and asked for a second. Professor Harbison seconded the amendment. President Hanrahan asked if there was unanimous consent to add “if requested”. The motion was approved.

President Hanrahan then asked the Senate to vote on the original amendment to replace “may” with “must”. The motion was approved.

Professor Woodman stated that there needs to be a timeline for when students can file an appeal. He made the motion to amend the policy to include that an appeal must be made within six weeks. The motion was seconded by Professor Lee. Professor Dussault noted that even now students can make an appeal through the grade appeal process and this process will still continue. Professor Kolbe, Johnny Carson School of Theatre Arts & Film, noted that each college has a grade appeals committee which grade appeals would be processed through.

Professor Dussault stated that if a faculty member fails a student for cheating, the faculty member would report this to Student Conduct which will then decide whether there needs to be follow up on the violation. He stated that if a student appeals the grade it goes through the college, and if the student appeals the findings of the Student Conduct Board it would go to the Student Conduct Appeals Board.

Professor Brown Kramer made the amendment that the six week time period to process an appeal be at the end of the semester. The amendment was seconded by Professor Adenwalla. Professor

Billesbach questioned whether imposing the time limit after the semester would impact a student's ability to register for a course. Professor Lee stated that he would support the first amendment and noted that students should appeal on the basis of what happens which could be independent of how it affects the whole semester. Professor Larsen, Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering, pointed out that students may be able to register for a course having failed the prerequisite for the course if the timeframe is six weeks which he thinks is too long. Professor Henderson, Philosophy, stated that six weeks might be too long, and thought that there should be some time limit. Assistant VC Johnson pointed out that in the Student Code of Conduct students have 14 days to appeal an adverse decision made against them. Dean Farrell, College of Business, reported that in the Business College students have to file a grade appeal within the first few weeks following a semester.

President Hanrahan asked for the vote on the amendment to state that the appeal timeline is at the end of the semester. The motion passed 29 in favor, 7 against.

Professor Kolbe, made a motion to amend the time for an appeal to 14 days rather than six weeks. Professor Vakilzadian, Electrical & Computer Engineering, seconded the motion. Professor Buan suggested that the time frame should be in compliance with the University sanctions. Professor Baesu, Mechanical and Materials Engineering, stated that 14 days makes sense, especially if the course is a prerequisite for another course. President Hanrahan asked for the vote on the amendment to have 14 days for an appeal. The motion passed 30 in favor, 7 against.

Professor Dunigan, Plant Pathology, asked if the 14 days would be calendar or business days. Professor Larsen moved the amendment read 14 calendar days. Professor Kolbe seconded the motion. Professor Glider, School of Biological Sciences, suggested that the language be the same as the Student Code of Conduct. Professor Castro, Textiles, Merchandising and Fashion Design, stated that the 14 calendar days should be when the university is open for business.

President Hanrahan asked how a student files an appeal. Professor Dussault stated that if a student admits that they committed a violation they would get a sanction from the date the grade is imposed. If they contest it they would file an appeal. President Hanrahan asked if students send an email or have to go to an office. Professor Dussault stated that if it is a judicial appeal they have to go to the Student Conduct & Community Standards office. If it is a grade appeal they must go through the college's appeal process. Professor Kolbe noted that in his college they can appeal through an email which is time stamped.

President Hanrahan asked for a vote of the motion to add 14 calendar days. The motion passed with 35 in favor and 3 against.

Professor Lindquist asked why we are creating this policy if no faculty members get any benefit from it. Professor Peterson, Agricultural Economics, pointed out that he was on the ad hoc committee that initially investigated academic integrity on campus, and the ad hoc committee became aware that the campus does really not have a sense of what is going on with respect to student behavior and academic integrity. He stated that the ad hoc committee felt that it was important for the campus to keep track of how widespread academic dishonesty is, and he believes that it is important for us to have a policy that will assist us in keeping track of this information. Professor Lindquist agrees with the need to obtain this information, but pointed out that this is not clear in the resolution. Professor Woodman noted that the policy clarifies what the faculty need to do and provides an opportunity for faculty members to receive feedback about what happens after they report an incident of academic dishonesty. He stated that there is the issue of what we do with the information once it is obtained.

President Hanrahan asked for the vote on the motion to create the Policy on Sanctions Related to Academic Integrity. The motion passed with 42 in favor, and 3 against.

## **7.2 Resolution in Support of Shared Governance of Financial Oversight at University of Nebraska-Lincoln**

President Hanrahan noted that the resolution was presented last month and asked if there was any discussion. Hearing none, he asked for a vote on the motion. The motion was approved.

## **7.3 Motion to Revise the Commencement and Honors Convocations Committee Syllabus**

President Hanrahan noted that the motion was presented last month and that the revisions seek to change the name of the Committee, approve the new regalia, and add staff members who are crucial to commencement ceremonies. He asked for discussion, and hearing none, he asked for a vote on the motion. The motion was approved.

## **8.0 New Business**

### **8.1 Incentive-Based Budget Model Update (VC Nunez and Dean Farrell)**

Agenda item postponed until the January 14<sup>th</sup> meeting.

### **8.2 Open Mic - Professional Conduct Committee Concerns**

Professor Minter, Chair of the Professional Conduct Committee, reported that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee has formed a Professional Conduct Committee to develop a policy on professional conduct. She noted that the Executive Committee felt that it would be best for the faculty to write the policy so the Conduct Committee would like to know what issues concern the faculty the most.

Professor Harbison stated that he has great reservations concerning such a policy. He pointed out that if the policy is limited to teaching, research, and service issues, he would be less worried, but a policy that would deal with anything in a faculty member's private life is a significant concern.

Professor Billesbach stated that one issue that concerns him is who this policy would apply to. Would it include professors, graduate teaching assistants, administrators? If it does not apply to administrators, will they have a separate code of conduct? President Hanrahan noted that the Board of Regents Bylaws defines who is considered a faculty member and the list includes postdocs. He stated that the Conduct Committee could establish who the code would apply to. Professor Lee reported that the Senate approved a [Professional Ethics Statement](#) in 2016, and while it does not have related sanctions or a process, it might be a good place for the Conduct Committee to begin.

Professor Adenwalla asked why we are doing this, what it is in response to, and what it will achieve. President Hanrahan stated that it is in response to a request by the Chancellor. He pointed out that there is no Code of Conduct listed in the Board of Regents Bylaws. He noted that the Chancellor asked if the Senate would take up the task because he felt it would be better for the Faculty Senate to develop a Code of Conduct rather than a taskforce formed by the administration. He stated that this effort needs to be faculty-driven, not driven by administrators.

Professor Larsen asked if administrative personnel have a Code of Conduct. President Hanrahan stated that he does not know of one. Professor Larsen asked if all administrators have a tenure home department. President Hanrahan stated that most do, but not all of them. Professor Dussault pointed out that many universities have a Professional Code of Conduct, which can be found on their website, but the Codes vary in complexity. Professor Minter stated that the Professional Conduct Committee has a Box folder where they are gathering information, and asked if anyone would like to suggest another university's code, to send the link to her.

Professor Adenwalla asked who would decide if someone has or hasn't violated a Code of Conduct? She pointed out that we do not want a Code that the administration can use as a weapon against the faculty. President Hanrahan stated that the administration would enforce the Code, but we have the Academic Rights & Responsibilities Committee Grievance Procedures that need to be adhered to. He noted that our sister campuses each have a Professional Code of Conduct, and he thinks it would be beneficial for us to adopt one.



Professor Stroup, Statistics, asked if it would be wrong to consider having a Professional Code of Conduct that applies to any member of the university community. Professor Minter stated that this is an interesting idea, but believes the staff must adhere to Human Resources' rules which faculty members aren't subject to. Professor Stroup stated that he is thinking of the Code applying to Chairs, Deans, Vice Chancellors, and the Chancellor, not just the faculty.

Professor Schwadel asked what is meant by professional code of conduct and asked if it would apply to what someone puts on Twitter. Professor Minter stated that some think it should apply to social media postings. She pointed out that there needs to be a commitment to academic freedom, and the Committee needs to determine what would be considered conduct versus rights and responsibilities. She stated that the members of the Committee have expressed these same concerns. She noted that the Committee felt that the absence of a Code had not eliminated the possibility of a faculty member being charged with misconduct. President Hanrahan pointed out that the recent Courtney Lawson case is an example. He noted that the administration stated that it was not her speech, but her conduct that caused her to be removed from teaching responsibilities. He pointed out that it would be better to have Code that clearly defines what would be considered misconduct.

Professor Baesu asked which Code would apply to a graduate student serving as a TA. President Hanrahan noted that if the student was teaching a class, then the faculty Code of Conduct would apply.

Professor Brown Kramer suggested that the Professional Conduct Committee should first frame what is considered conduct and what isn't. She noted that what we do in class and what we do outside of the university is clear, and people should not be sanctioned for doing something outside of the university. Professor Larsen stated that he does not have an issue with faculty being held to a higher standard, but the same needs to be true for administrators.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:27 p.m. The next meeting of the Faculty Senate will be held on Tuesday, January 14, 2020, at 2:30 p.m. in the City Campus Union, Regency Suite. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator, and Joan Latta Konecky, Secretary.