

INTERDEPARTMENTAL


Records of the  
Faculty Senate,  
vol. 43

207

FACULTY SENATE  
AD-20

Date: 25 May 1993

To: Faculty Senate

From: Miceal F. Vaughan   
Chair, Faculty Senate

Re: Attached Documents as Background Information for  
Item 11 on the 27 May 1993 Senate Meeting Agenda

At its 24 May 1993 continuation meeting, the Senate Executive Committee voted to forward the attached documents to you as background information for our impending discussion of the revisions to the Adjudication Procedures submitted by the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs (FCFA).

The first document is an attempt to summarize the main conclusions arrived at by the Executive Committee over the past four-and-a-half months -- indicating the level of consensus (or lack thereof) on a number of issues.

The second is a memo from Professor John Junker, a colleague from the Law School, who has been long involved with our Adjudication Procedures and has been actively engaged in the current Executive Committee review of the FCFA proposal.

In addition to these, the Faculty Senate Office (36 Administration Building) has a complete file of comments and suggestions sent in by concerned and interested faculty and staff since deliberations on the current draft began. Please feel free to stop by the Office to review these documents if they are of interest to you.

*A. IMPROVEMENTS CONTAINED IN FCFA REVISION  
RECOMMENDED BY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE*

1. Requiring a Dean (the Human Rights Office or any other authorized administrative official) to submit to the Provost a written report detailing any allegations against a faculty member (generated in compliance with the procedures presented in 25-71, or other relevant Sections of the Code) before any action is initiated against the said faculty member. (28-32.A)
2. Requiring the Provost to submit the case to a Hearing Committee before initiating any action against a faculty member. (28-32.A)
3. Using Brief Adjudicative Proceedings to handle minor disputes. (28-33; 28-41)
4. Including Assistant Professors among those who may serve on Adjudication Panels. (28-33.B)
5. Engaging the services of attorneys as Hearing Officers. (28-33.C)
6. Requiring a representatively diverse Hearing Panel. (28-33.F)
7. Encouraging mediation/conciliation at a number of distinct places in the procedures. (e.g., 28-35.C; 28-36.B; 28-52.C)
8. Having Brief Adjudication Procedures conducted by the Hearing Officer alone. (28-41.C,D,E)
9. Awarding no more than a tie-breaking vote to the Hearing Officer, and so avoiding one reason for having alternates. (28-54.A)
10. Reducing lengths of time allotted to various stages of the proceedings. (distributed throughout)

