Faculty Affairs Committee
THURSDAY, MARCH 21, 2002

Members Present: Bonnie Fritz, Hugh Hudson, Kathryn Kozaitis, Astrid Lipp, Charles Marvin, Ramona Matthews, Linda McGehee, Cherian Thachenkary, Diane Willen


Diane Willen, chair, called the meeting to order at 12:07 p.m.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes for the February 20, 2002 meeting were approved.

Policy on Student Disruptive Behavior

On behalf of Leonard Teel and Bonnie Fritz, Diane Willen circulated a draft of the Policy on Student Disruptive Behavior, dated March 12, for Committee approval. Hugh Hudson noted that other colleges and academic units may already have their own policies which cannot supersede senate policy. The last sentence of the preamble was cut and Charles Marvin recommended adding this sentence in its place: "The individual college or academic unit may have supplementary procedures to deal with disruptive student behavior."

Section 2: Linda McGehee noted that the first sentence of the document was not clear. The sentence was amended as follows: "If the instructor believes the disruptive behavior poses a threat to the safety of the instructor, or the student himself/herself or other students in the classroom or if the disruptive behavior continues on a subsequent day, then the instructor with the approval of the chair or director, has the option at that point to bar the disruptive student temporarily from that class." The Committee believed that since the chair is brought into this process in section 1, and since it may not be possible to obtain permission from the chair in a timely manner under such conditions, that the requirement of "approval of the chair" be struck from the policy. Fritz recommended adding "or" in between "classroom" and "if" so as to separate threatening behavior from disruptive behavior.

Hugh Hudson commented on the difference between a threat and disruptive behavior and suggested splitting Section 2 in order to address these two individually. Charles Marvin detailed the three remedies (being ordered to leave class; barring the student from class; disenrolling the student) and specified the various behaviors that would demand each remedy. He suggested dividing Section 1 into two parts in order to distinguish between one-time disruptive behavior and on-going disruptive behavior.

Willen said that she would ask the Executive Committee for a one-day extension so that the policy could be revised further. Fritz asked if degrees of severity of behavior need to be addressed. Hudson said that the policy just needs to address three types of disruptive behavior: one-time, on-going, and threatening. Astrid Lipp raised the question of how to handle threatening behavior in between classes. Willen suggested that the committee not divide any of the sections. The Committee moved on with no other changes to Section 2. Cherian Thachenkary recommended including a reference to this policy on all syllabi so that students would know where to find the policy.

Section 3: The following change was made to this section: "Also within five working days of removal from the class, the student may submit to the department chair or school director a written appeal, detailing the basis for the student's denial of the charges. The written appeal shall detail the basis of the student's denial of the charges." Fritz explained that Larry Rifkin wanted to make sure the policy included an opportunity for the student to submit an appeal in writing early in the process.

Section 4: Charles Marvin called for clearer and more consistent language in this section. The following changes were made: "The department chair or school director shall review all written reports documents pertaining to the alleged disruptive behavior to determine within a maximum of five working days of the initial incident of alleged student disruptive behavior if further actions should be taken by the college or academic unit or if the student should be exonerated allowed to return to class."

Section 6: Because of the subjective interpretation of “dissatisfied,” the first sentence of Section 6 was change to: “If the student is dissatisfied with the decision of the department chair or school director, then the student may appeal the decision of the department chair or school director to the dean's office of the academic unit within five working days of the decision by the department chair or school director.”

Section 7: For the reason stated in Section 6, the following change was made to Section 7: "If the student is dissatisfied with the decision of the dean's office, then the student may appeal the decision of the dean's office to the Provost's office within five working days of the decision by the dean."
Sections 8 and 9: The Committee felt that “exonerated” was not the appropriate word for Sections 8 & 9, since a resolution other than finding the student innocent of the charges may be reached. The changes to the beginning of both sections are as follows: “If not exonerated, the charge of disruptive behavior is sustained.”

Willen said she would make the recommended changes and circulate the revised document electronically for a vote of approval. If approved, it would be sent to the Executive Committee.

Policy on Full-Time Non-Tenure Track Personnel

Willen circulated the text of a possible future Resolution for an Increase in Tenure-Track Faculty Appointments. The executive committee requested feedback on the resolution. Cherian Thachenkary noted that the language in the resolution did not conform to the language in the NTT Policy as amended on the floor of the senate on 14 March. Thachenkary also reminded the Committee that the resolution represents a goal and not a mandate. The Committee voted to support the resolution.

Willen reported survey results as collected by the Institutional Research Office on behalf of the NTT subcommittee. Fifteen Universities responded, fourteen of which were applicable to GSU. Ten of the respondents use non-tenure track titles similar to the titles GSU is moving toward. Four of the respondents use rank. No university uses the “professor of Practice” title. Willen said she will distribute the data to the Committee at a later date.

Other Business

A new chair will be elected at the next Faculty Affairs meeting, which is scheduled for Wednesday, April 17. Willen adjourned the meeting at approximately 1:17 p.m.