Diane Willen, chair, called the meeting to order at 12:05 p.m.

**Approval of Minutes**

The amended Minutes for the November 28, 2001 meeting were approved as corrected.

**Non-Tenure Track Faculty**

Bonnie Fritz made a motion to specify to the Subcommittee that, among other issues, the Committee is especially concerned with modifications in rank that address the possibility of Senior Lecturer and Professor of Practice. Some members of the Committee did not feel that this specification was not reflected in the minutes from the previous meeting. The motion passed.

Diane Willen reported that Michael Moore offered to assist with the Subcommittee’s research, but requested that the Committee provide him with a few specific questions to ask. Willen said that she would write questions and seek approval from the Subcommittee before forwarding them to Moore.

**Policy on Student Disruptive Behavior**

Willen reported that the Student Action and Life Committee did not forward anything to her about this policy. Leonard Teel distributed a draft of the Policy with the Subcommittee’s changes highlighted in bold, which included a recommendation for a different timetable as well as added definitions and examples. Teel reported that the timetable was a key point of disagreement between the Student Government and the Subcommittee. The current timetable benefits the student, and the Subcommittee felt that a more balanced approach was necessary.

The Committee discussed the Policy and made several suggestions. Dave Pavesic suggested that the student be given a written warning after the initial verbal warning if the disruptive behavior continues and recommended that a standard form be created for this purpose. It was also suggested that “a threat to safety” as mentioned in paragraph three remain as one issue, but that another issue of disrupting student concentration and the learning environment be added. Willen suggested setting off the safety issue in a separate paragraph to give it prominence. Weed suggested adding some form of “self” to the first sentence of the third paragraph (“If the disruptive behavior poses a threat to the safety of the instructor, other students, or the disruptive student himself/herself…”)).

Thachenkary asked if summoning the campus police to remove the student from class ought to trigger an automatic disenrollment. The Committee agreed that after the first instance of disruption, the professor shall give the student either a verbal or written warning (or both) depending of the severity of the disruption as judged by the professor. The student will not be removed from the class after the first warning unless the behavior raises certain safety or legal issues, or unless the student continues with the disruptive behavior. The second warning must be in writing.

The Committee also agreed to move the definition of disruptive behavior to the top of the document and to have it included in all syllabi. In the ninth paragraph, the Committee suggested changing the wording to, “If the student is not exonerated of the charges of disruptive behavior, the instructor will assign a grade of W or WF according to University policy[…]” (changes in italics). Under the heading “Loss of Financial Aid,” the Committee recommended changing the end of the second sentence to “for any financial aid loss.” Under the heading “Definition of Disruptive Behavior/Examples,” the Committee recommended changing the second sentence to “Such behavior would include, but is not limited to verbal or physical threats, repeated obscenities and/or hate talk, incivility, obstruction of learning either verbally, physically, electronically, or otherwise.” (Changes in italics)

Teel asked the Committee for feedback on the revised timetable. The Committee agreed that it was acceptable as revised.

Willen asked Teel to take the Committee’s suggestions and return in January with an updated draft. She said that she would follow up with the students [not sure which student group you were referring to] for their feedback.

**Evaluation of Administrators**

Willen reported that the Executive Committee has forwarded a new charge to Faculty Affairs. An email from John
DeCastro asked for all evaluation procedures to be explored and reviewed to make sure they are equitable and symmetrical (in other words, that the procedures were comparable for all administrators at a particular level). The Executive Committee also requested a review of whether the procedures should be improved to produce a better evaluation. Willen said she would ask for additional information from the committee. Lyn Thaxton reported that the concerns expressed in John DeCastro’s email were not shared by all members of the Executive Committee. Clance commented that there are concerns within the University that evaluations are ineffectual because no action appears to result from them. Willen said that data is not saved from one evaluation period to another, so it is impossible to compare evaluations and check for performance improvement or decline.

**Student Evaluations**

Teel asked what was expected of this Subcommittee. Willen said she’d check to see what the charge is, and added that the Committee is not being pressed on any charge for the Subcommittee at this time.

**Other Business**

Willen announced that the Non-Tenure Track recommendation, the Amorous Relation Policy, and Student Disruptive Behavior Policy will be agenda items for the January meeting, which will be held on January 29th at noon. Willen adjourned the meeting at approximately 1:15 p.m.