
UC Council Room
October 6, 2021 3:30 p.m.-5:00 p.m.
MINUTES

Brown, Doerner (Johnson), Endres, Johnson, Matchett, Senbet, Sileo, Williams
Applegate, Blatt, Fulks, Murza, Wiegand

Approved without objection.

- We will review the RSCW Misconduct revision with the committee chair and the director of the Student-Faculty Dispute Complaints Report is also ready for review.

•

The committee reviewed a clean copy of the RSCW Misconduct revision. The type of plagiarism outside the scope of the RSCW Misconduct policy.

MOTION: Williams – It is moved to approve the RSCW Misconduct revision and send to Codification.

VOTE: Approved by voice vote.

•

Sat

1. Discrimination, harassment and/or retaliation of students, employees and/or other persons in violation of law or University policy;
2. Other treatment of students, employees, and/or other persons in violation of applicable law or University policy;
3. Violations of law(s) or University policy substantially related to the fitness of the faculty member to engage in teaching, research, or service to the University;
4. Greater than de minimis use of University property for other than University purposes;
5. Academic misconduct;
6. Refusal or failure to perform reasonable assigned duties; and/or
7. Disclosure of confidential information or education records in violation of law or University policy.

Note: If any of the minor misconduct behaviors are severe or repetitive, they may become serious misconduct and result in serious discipline (i.e., dismissal, suspension, demotion, or reduction in compensation).

List of sanctions (other than dismissal, suspension, demotion, or reduction in compensation) for minor misconduct:

1. Oral reprimand;
2. Written reprimand;
3. Completion of additional education;
4. Required performance management meetings with Department Chair, Dean or Provost; and/or
5. Ineligibility for prospective benefits (e.g., salary increases or promotion eligibility) for a stated period.

DISCUSSION:

We need a framework of definitions before drafting a policy.

- Serious versus Minor Misconduct – what types of infractions qualify as serious or minor; at what point do minor violations rise to serious violations
- Serious versus Minor Discipline – any discipline is minor that is not: dismissal, suspension, demotion, or reduction in compensation

Consider *who* may initiate complaints/sanctions against a faculty member; what channels will the process follow.

We need to consider *who* determines whether misconduct rises to minor/serious levels and what sanction(s) are appropriate for particular cases of misconduct.

- Potential for policy to be wielded inappropriately; difficulty in deter

- Policies already exist that address expectations for behavior/conduct; some instances may not readily fit into specific categories
- AAUP may have guidelines regarding when certain types of sanctions (e.g., reduction in rank, suspension) may/may not be appropriate

What appeal process should be created to provide checks/balances (e.g., a faculty review committee).

- Under what circumstances should decisions be able to be appealed

The policy should address issues that are not already remedied in the established evaluation policies or grievance policies.

Consider whether to create a policy to address only major/serious misconduct.

- Potential for abuse of policy at the minor levels, resulting in inappropriate penalties with long-term consequences

versus

- Inability to address/correct at the minor level may result in conduct rising to

r