
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 RSCW Misconduct Committee. The RSCW Misconduct Committee will lead the committee.
• 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 ○ ○ ○ ○ 4 c 0 T c e e d 3 .