

GENERAL FACULTY MEETING
April 30, 2013

1. Call to Order.

PRESIDENT HARRIS PASTIDES greeted his faculty colleagues and called the meeting to order.

2. Approval of Minutes.

PRESIDENT PASTIDES asked for corrections to the minutes of the last General Faculty meeting on September 5, 2012. There were none, and the minutes were approved as submitted.

3. Report of the President.

PRESIDENT HARRIS PASTIDES observed that as we near the end of the semester, it is a time to celebrate our students' accomplishments and faculty accomplishments, as well.

The President noted that he would soon be starting the traditional "USC commencement marathon, beginning in Beaufort at 6 pm on Friday, May 26, and concluding 14 official commencements later, including hooding exercises for the School of Law, the School of Medicine, and the Arnold School of Public Health. He expected that his grand total of handshakes with graduates will number around 6,730.

President Pastides was recently involved in the conferring of the awards to our most distinguished students. These ceremonies included:

The **Algernon Sidney Sullivan Awards**: these are the highest undergraduate awards conferred by our university. This year, Lauren Victoria Nottoli of Columbia and John Brewer Eberly, Jr., of Greenville received these awards.

The **Steven N. Swanger Leadership Award**: often referred to as the second highest honor, this award has as much to do with community and public service as it does for academic standing. This year's winner is Kenneth Gerard Tracy, Jr. Until recently, Mr. Tracy was the President of the Student Government Association here in Columbia.

The **Goldwater Scholars Award**: Winners are:

Drew Delorenzo a junior majoring in Marine Science, Biochemistry, and Molecular Biology, and a member of the Honor's College.

Mackenzie Sunday, a junior in the Honors College pursuing her specifically designed degree, the Baccalaureus Artium et Scientiae degree, focusing on neuroscience.

This is the 21st consecutive year that our University students have been named as Goldwater Scholars. We have had 43 of them since 1990. President Pastides thanked the Goldwater

Committee, chaired by Douglas Meade, but also including Melissa Moss, Scott Goode, Susan Alexander, and Gwen Geidel.

Fulbright Scholars Awards:

- Kalie Esancy, a senior Biology major, will be traveling to France to do her work.
- Amanda Williams, a senior Biomedical Engineering student, going to Taiwan.
- Sarah Wojcik, a senior Early Childhood Education major, will be going to Germany.
- An alternate, Adam Kess, is an International Business major who is hoping to still be selected by the Fulbright committee.

President Pastides thanked everyone who participated in the Awards Day ceremonies, encouraged faculty members to attend one or more of our commencement ceremonies.

The President noted that this is also the season when we celebrate our faculty scholars, starting that night with the University's Rising Stars, young faculty researchers who have been singled out for recognition by Dr. Prakash Nagarkatti. The following day, we will celebrate our faculty award winners in another ceremony with Provost Michael Amiridis. We are proud of all of our student and faculty scholars, and proud of their accomplishments this year.

President Pastides delivered an update on the Administration Team's advocacy for the University with the State Legislature, most recently at the Senate Finance Committee. The President reiterated the idea that the only path to new money from State Government is for new ideas. We need to share evidence that we are an accessible university, primarily to South Carolinians, that we hold ourselves and our students to very high standards of quality and accomplishment, and that we facilitate the flexibility to graduate on time, potentially in a less traditional way.

The House of Representatives has allocated new money for two initiatives. One is Palmetto College. The other is the On Your Time graduation initiative to compensate faculty and others who care for students in the summer to provide more required courses. Funding for these initiatives are being presented at \$2.115 million and \$5 million, respectively, and we are hoping to get the Senate's approval to receive this new money.

There is some new money for our comprehensive campuses in Beaufort, in Spartanburg and in Aiken to get them up to where the median is in that comprehensive sector. Our main campus is in the research sector, along with Clemson and the Medical University of South Carolina. All other four-year colleges are in the comprehensive sector, and are allowed to offer up through the master's degree. Our three comprehensive universities are funded significantly lower per South Carolina FTE than some others, and the legislature has allocated \$1.7 million to distribute to those three campuses to address the disparity in funding.

President Pastides observed that it continues to be a time of great upheaval and change in American public higher education, maybe only second to health care reform. The trend is toward increased use of technology, and an increased focus on preparing graduates for jobs. The President noted that this is an international phenomenon; universities in other countries are being called to focus on majors and career paths that would lead to jobs and a vibrant economy.

Another trend is toward significant cutbacks across the nation in state funding. South Carolina started the cuts earlier and, perhaps, has gotten beyond the cuts a little sooner but the cuts continue in other states.

Even at the federal level, we are not really hearing that much about the traditional metrics of excellence in higher education. What we do hear about is affordability and the need to keep the costs of education down. We have already seen declines in faculty research funding. Our Vice-President for Research, Dr. Prakash Nagarkatti, estimates a 10% decline in total sponsored research for the university. President Pastides observed that this will be the first decline of this kind in his 15 years at USC. Dr. Nagarkatti attributes the decline to cuts in the Department of Energy and Department of Defense, in particular, and in other parts of government.

President Pastides expressed concern about the Pell Grants and federal scholarships should this round of sequestration go into the next fiscal year (the Federal fiscal year begins on October 1st). So far the loans have been protected so that students who were offered loans in this fiscal year will keep them but we don't know about next year. The President is confident that if there are cuts to the Pell Grant and other Federal Grant and Aid Programs, we will have fewer students who are able to afford their education at the University of South Carolina.

While the implications of the federal sequestration presents a concern regarding student aid programs, President Pastides does not think that will happen for next year. We are having our own budget meetings now with units around the campus. Our Faculty Senate Chair, Professor Kelly, as well as other colleagues on several Faculty Senate committees, sits in on those budget meetings, as do the President of the Student Government Association and other representatives. The goal is that next year be the best year in the history of this university in spite of the economic outlook.

4. Report of Provost.

SENIOR VICE PROVOST CHRISTINE CURTIS delivered the report on behalf of Provost Michael Amiridis. Following a longstanding University tradition, Dr. Curtis announced the winners of this year's Faculty Awards:

Faculty Advising and Mentoring Awards

John Gardner Inspirational Faculty Member Award:

Cassandra Giraudy, Arnold School of Public Health.

Outstanding Undergraduate Research Mentor Award:

Professor John Grady, Department of Sport and Entertainment Management in the College of Hospitality, Retail, and Sport Management.

Professor Camelia Knapp, Department of Earth and Ocean Sciences

Professor Joseph Quattro, Department of Biological Sciences.

Ada B. Thomas Outstanding Faculty Advisor Award:

Professor John Kupfer, Department of Geography, College of Arts and Sciences

Ada B. Thomas Outstanding Staff Advisor Award:

Ms. Patricia Armstrong, Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice.

Research Awards

Russell Research Award for Humanities and Social Sciences

Professor Larry Rhu, Department of English, College of Arts and Sciences.

Russell Research Award for Science, Mathematics and Engineering

Professor Ralf Gothe, Department of Physics, College of Arts and Sciences

USC Educational Foundation Research Award for Health Sciences

Professor Steven Blair, Department of Exercise Science, Arnold School of Public Health

USC Educational Foundation Research Award for Humanities and Social Sciences

Professor Brent Simpson, Department of Sociology, College of Arts and Sciences.

USC Educational Foundation Research Award for Science, Mathematics and Engineering

Professor John Weidner, Department of Chemical Engineering, College of Engineering and Computing

USC Educational Foundation Research Award for Professional Schools

Professor William Brown, Department of Educational Studies, College of Education

USC Educational Foundation Outstanding Service Award

Professor Scott Goode, Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, College of Arts and Sciences

Carolina Trustee Professorships

Professor Michael Angel, Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, USC Columbia

Professor Katherine Chaddock, College of Education, Department of Educational Leadership and Policies, USC Columbia

Professor Maureen Carrigan, Department of Psychology, USC Aiken

Teaching Awards

John J. Duffy Excellence in Teaching Award

Professor Bettie Obi Johnson, Division of Math, Science, Nursing, and Public Health, USC Lancaster

Clinical Practice Teaching Award

Professor Allan Brett, Department of Internal Medicine, School of Medicine

Professor Scott Sutton, Department of Clinical Pharmacy and Outcomes Sciences, South Carolina College of Pharmacy

Michael J. Mungo Undergraduate Teaching Award

Professor Danny Jenkins, School of Music

Professor Ann Johnson, Department of History and Philosophy, College of Arts and Sciences

Professor Amy Mills, Department of Geography, College of Arts and Sciences

Professor Michael Myrick, Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, College of Arts and Sciences

Michael J. Mungo Graduate Teaching Award

Professor James Stallworth, Department of Pediatrics, School of Medicine

Michael J. Mungo Distinguished Professor of the Year Award

Professor Claudia Benitez-Nelson, Director of Marine Science, School of the Earth, Ocean and Environment, College of Arts and Sciences

Carolina Distinguished Professor Award

Professor Ronald Benner, Department of Biological Sciences, College of Arts and Sciences

Professor Roger Dougal, College of Engineering and Computing, Department of Electrical Engineering

Professor Robyn Hunt, Department of Theatre and Dance, College of Arts and Sciences

Professor Mitzi Nagarkatti, Department of Pathology, Microbiology and Immunology, School of Medicine

Professor James Ritter, Department of Chemical Engineering, College of Engineering and Computing

Professor Qian Wang, Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, College of Arts and Sciences

Senior Vice Provost Curtis invited Senators and faculty to attend the Faculty Awards at 2:30 p.m. on May 1 in the Hollings Room of the Thomas Cooper Library.

Dr. Curtis delivered an update on Palmetto College, which launched on April 18th. Palmetto College is our online degree initiative in collaboration with the Regional Campuses. The first 60 hours, whether they are at USC Regional Campuses or at Tech Colleges or somewhere else, feed into USC online for Palmetto College. Palmetto College will offer seven degrees this fall and USC Columbia will provide three of the degrees. The College of Education is working on an Elementary Education degree that will be part of Palmetto College.

We also have two other degrees that come out of Columbia. These degrees are fairly long standing. They have been in the Palmetto Programs and now that has morphed into the Palmetto College. These degrees come out of the Extended University part of Columbia and are the Bachelors of Liberal Studies and the Bachelors of Organizational Leadership.

The other four degrees will come from the senior campuses – the comprehensive campuses, as mentioned by President Pastides. We are excited to be moving into a new arena, providing affordable access for the people of the state to bachelor's degrees.

Senior Vice Provost Curtis concluded her report with news of a new faculty benefit. It is called the Plus One Program. The Plus One Program offers opportunities to our faculty to have one other member of their household – someone who resides in their household – who is 18 or above included for access to the library and to our recreational facilities – the Strom Thurmond and/or the Blatt. In order to gain this access, one has to have a Plus One card, obtained at the Carolina Card Office. The faculty member and the Plus One member need to go together to the Carolina Card Office to obtain this card. Faculty members who have questions should contact the Carolina Card Office.

Dr. Curtis thanked everyone for their hard work this year, and extended her wishes for a productive and restful summer.

5. Reports of Committees.

PROFESSOR JIM KNAPP (Earth and Ocean Sciences), Chair of Faculty Advisory Committee, presented two sets of proposed changes to the USC Columbia Faculty Manual. The Senate was not asked to vote on the changes at this meeting; the Committee's intent was to introduce the changes to the faculty community and initiate a 3 month period of comment. The Committee will use feedback to refine the changes and hopes to bring them to a vote at the September General Faculty meeting.

These are both proposals that have either originated from faculty committees or worked their way through the appropriate channels and have arrived at the Faculty Advisory Committee. Per the provisions of the Faculty Manual the Committee presents them to the faculty.

The first of these is a recommendation from USC Graduate Council to revise the terminology in the Faculty Manual concerning membership on the Graduate Faculty. Draft copies are accessible online at the Policies and Procedures link under the Faculty Manual. The rationale for this proposed revision is that there currently is no provision for non-tenure-track USC faculty to direct doctoral dissertations or participate in the governance of the Graduate School. The proposal from the Graduate Council was to create a new category of “associate member” of the Graduate Faculty, which would confer the right to both clinical and research faculty to chair committees and actually participate on Graduate Council.

The second provision is relatively minor and would eliminate the requirement for meetings of the Graduate Faculty every semester. The Graduate Council perceives the requirement as an onerous task in which few people participate.

Professor Knapp presented the items in terms of the current wording in the Faculty Manual and the proposed changes. The main change is the creation of an “associate membership” and the way in which that associate membership would be handled through a nomination by the Graduate Faculty of a unit to the Graduate Council. Professor Knapp invited faculty members to review the changes and opened the floor for discussion or comment.

PROFESSOR CHRISTIAN ANDERSON (Education) asked for further explanation of the provision to create “associate members” of the Graduate Faculty, their rights and responsibilities, and their potential to serve in the Faculty Senate.

PROFESSOR KNAPP noted that this proposal was originally developed by the Graduate Council in 2009 but, mainly due to the restructuring of the Graduate School, it did not arrive at the Faculty Advisory Committee until this year. Professor Knapp’s recollection is that one of the issues in question was whether the conferring of Graduate Faculty status and voting membership on the Graduate Faculty included voting membership in other capacities. The current proposal makes clear that membership on the Graduate Faculty relates to voting on Graduate Faculty issues, it does not confer other faculty voting rights.

PROFESSOR EVA CZABARKA (Mathematics) observed that the policy seems to indicate that the associate member of the Graduate Faculty would be doing graduate work with the home unit. Would it be possible for an associate member to direct graduate work in another department?

PROFESSOR KNAPP deferred the question to Professor Cheryl Addy, a professor in Public Health who has had a long term association with the proposed policy.

PROFESSOR CHERYL ADDY (Public Health) explained that, under the policy, the description of doctoral committee membership is that the Director of the Doctoral Committee should be in the student’s program. So *service* on a committee does not require membership in that student’s department but someone *chairing* the committee and directing a dissertation should be a member of the student’s department.

DEAN MARY ANNE FITZPATRICK (Arts and Sciences) noted that the College of Arts and Sciences has a number of interdisciplinary institutes that house active research faculty are not necessarily members of an academic department. She wondered how the policy would apply to them. She also wondered if, for example, a currently tenured or tenure-track faculty member in Biochemistry could direct a dissertation in Biology and what would be the conditions that would allow that?

PROFESSOR JOHN DAWSON (Chemistry and Biochemistry) reported that his department has had over the years a few examples of Chemistry faculty who have had students work in Biology or vice versa, but the department has always felt that the formal advisor or director of the student's research should be from Chemistry, even though the students were working in a Biology lab on what was essentially a collaborative project between people from both departments.

DEAN LACY FORD (Graduate School) confirmed that the current status of the issue is that, under normal circumstances, the dissertation advisor is from the home department of the student. He noted that there could probably be exceptions granted if the case could be made, but they would be just that – exceptions and not the rule. Dean Ford clarified that even under the new policy, if it is adopted in the fall, the associate member will have to be sponsored and approved through a department, so the people who are not with the department would have to go up through a department to acquire associate member status.

PROFESSOR KNAPP presented the second item of business from the Advisory Committee, an initiative from the Faculty Welfare Committee, the Workplace Bullying Policy. Professor David Mott, who Chairs the Committee, and the other Committee members have worked very hard and diligently over the past year to develop the policy. The policy has grown out of essentially a yearlong effort to address an issue that the University Ombudsman brought to the attention of quite a number of faculty; that on an annual basis a significant percentage of the cases that the Ombudsman hears are in some way related to the issue of bullying. The policy is an attempt to have some more formal mechanism to respond to that on a university level.

The issue has gone through an extensive discussion and development within the Faculty Senate over the past year but ultimately it is up to the General Faculty to either approve or disapprove this proposed change to the Faculty Manual. By way of background, Professor Knapp noted that the Faculty Manual currently contains no definition of workplace bullying. It provides no guidelines to faculty who feel that they are victims of this process. Many other universities have implemented similar types of provisions.

Professor Knapp provided a brief summary of these proposed revisions:

- Move the text of the Carolinian Creed formally into the body of the Faculty Manual.
- Create a new faculty committee on Professional Conduct, made up of faculty and organized by faculty.
- Add a section in the Faculty Manual on workplace civility.

Accompanying these proposed changes to the Faculty Manual is a proposed new policy on workplace bullying. This has been proposed through the channels for instituting or changing

policies within the universities through Academic Affairs, initiated by the Faculty Welfare Committee. Professor Knapp projected the image of a related document that goes with the proposed changes to the Faculty Manual. The document includes a definition of what is considered to be bullying and the procedures for how to address that through faculty channels to achieve a satisfactory resolution. The issue has been discussed and vetted through the Faculty Senate, through a number of faculty committees, through certain parts of the administration and is now put before the Faculty for additional comment and discussion. Professor Knapp opened the floor for questions or comments.

PROFESSOR ROBERT BEST (School of Medicine-Greenville) asked for some background on the vetting of the policy. He noted that discussion of the issue has been going on for at least 7 years.

PROFESSOR KNAPP explained that his involvement in the issue began about a year and a half ago when Chair Sandra Kelly took over the helm of the Faculty Senate and took on as a priority the examination of whether this was a direction in which the Faculty Senate wanted to go. Since that time, the policy has been developed through the Faculty Welfare Committee and has received regular discussion at essentially every Faculty Senate meeting over the last year. It has been through the Faculty Advisory Committee, it's before the General Counsel of the University, and the Provost's Office has had a major role in helping shape the policy. It has been through a lot of revision and discussion, and every time the Committee brings it to a new constituency, it learns more about how the policy might be improved.

In response to Professor Knapp's request for feedback, faculty members offered the following (included unedited):

PROFESSOR LASZLO SZEKELY (Mathematics) :

I see that bullying is a problem and I also see that this is very difficult to handle by procedures and committees. I emphasize that I appreciate very much the effort and the work that was put into this draft, as it attempts to handle a very difficult problem.

I would like to sum up in ten paragraphs what is wrong with the current draft of the Workplace Bullying Policy.

1) Dismissal of tenured faculty is like capital punishment in real life.

It is a big thing, and the draft policy discusses it casually as a natural step to manage the incorrigible bullies. For comparison, the sexual harassment is much bigger issue than workplace bullying, as federal law allows the victims of sexual harassment to sue, while there is no particular federal law for victims of bullying.

Still, the Sexual Harassment Policy of the University does not use the explicit word "dismissal" anywhere. (And I am not arguing for the casual inclusion of dismissals into the Sexual Harassment Policy.)

2) In the current Faculty Manual, the president can initiate dismissal of tenured faculty, and the president, the Faculty Advisory Committee and the Tenure Board have carefully designed duties.

In this procedure, the accused has strong procedural protection, like - right to have a counsel - "clear and convincing evidence" should be found against him - the burden of proof stands with the president.

These procedural protections are missing during the procedure against the accused bully. As this is really the first stage of a lengthy multi-stage procedure towards dismissal, these protections have to be already there at this first stage.

3) Dismissal procedures are truly rare. Perhaps bullying procedures are expected to be more frequent.

It might explain why the procedure is simpler. However, at any procedure where any punishment (especially dismissal) is in sight, there should be procedural protection for the accused at the same level like at the dismissal procedure.

4) By including "gossips" "malicious rumors" as forms of bullying, this policy restricts the freedom of speech, a constitutional right. I am against it. For comparison, the Sexual Harassment Policy requires consultation with the university legal counsel while investigating incidents, if the accused thinks that he acted within his constitutional rights. The purpose of this consultation is to find out whether the accused acted within his constitutional rights. There are no such things as constitutional rights mentioned in the bullying policy.

5) Bullying - like sexual harassment - is not a faculty-on-faculty issue, though the policy handles it in this way. An example: a colleague of mine (in another department) thinks that he gets his summer salary late in every summer, since the business manager picks on him. If it is true, it is bullying, and it would be even sabotage. But the business manager is not a faculty member and the current draft would not resolve this problem. In case my colleague raises his voice, he will be the bully. Note that the sexual harassment policy covers everybody on campus, not just the faculty. Bullying should be handled similarly, for everyone on campus.

6) According to the current draft, not just physical persons, but also the institution can bring the charge of bullying. Who represents the institution? The Associate Department Chair? The Vice President for Parking? For comparison, in the dismissal procedure, the institution must be represented by the president. Another issue: for a false charge, if the accuser is a person, he may be held accountable. What if the institution brings a false charge?

The next 3 paragraphs discuss that many issues addressed by the policy can be more efficiently handled by enforcement of existing laws.

7) Sabotage is not bullying. (Can anyone explain how faculty can do sabotage while doing teaching and research? If he does not teach, he can be fired under the dismissal procedures, if he does not research, he can be fired similarly, after a longer period of time, for not passing his post-tenure review.) Employment laws should be sufficient to punish or get rid of saboteurs.

8) Cyberbullying: federal laws already have teeth on unauthorized use of computers. Those can be used instead of internal procedures.

9) If somebody is intimidating and shuts the door on you: call for police. This is within your rights. It is better than internal procedures.

Summing up the first 9 paragraphs:

10) This policy creates new problems and legal responsibilities without solving those that it attempts to solve and it is not written on equivalent high standards of other university policies or sections of the Faculty Manual. I am against this draft policy.

PROFESSOR DRUCILLA BARKER (Anthropology & Women's and Gender Studies):
And I simply wanted to speak to the notion that bullying is and sexual harassment can be collapsed together. Ever since sexual harassment first came to the national attention with Anita Hill 20 years ago, legal scholars have written that the sexual harassment laws are inadequate because they do not cover the bullying aspect that is often not a clear case of sexual harassment. It is not a clear case of creating a hostile workplace environment but there was big gray area that needed to be covered by such a policy. Now I respect the professor's concerns with due process. I certainly would like to see the policy refined somewhat for due process but sexual harassment is not an adequate policy and we do need a policy like this. I just think it needs to be tweaked but as I say the scholars in this area – legal scholars on sexual harassment have been arguing for this for many, many years.

PROFESSOR DAVID MOTT (School of Medicine) – I am the Chair of Faculty Welfare Committee. I just wanted to address a couple of points. The first is that the policy emphasizes informal resolution of bullying complaints. The formal resolution is a secondary aspect of the policy and there are many possible outcomes that could come from the investigative process that would be done by a faculty committee. One of those that was spoken about earlier is the fact that the faculty committee can, as a recommended remedy to the Provost, can recommend for dismissal of a faculty member. They cannot dismiss a faculty member. They can recommend for dismissal. That would then serve as a cause – a cause for dismissal according to the Faculty Manual and would be handled like any other cause for dismissal through the procedures in the Faculty Manual. They would go through all of the procedures they would go to the Grievance Committee, the entire thing just as you would have done any other cause for dismissal. So the policy does not allow people to be dismissed for bullying. It does not do that. It allows for a recommendation for dismissal to be put before the Faculty Grievance Committee.

So that is one point that I wanted to clarify and that would only be in the most egregious cases. The policy is primarily designed to make the process of informal resolution more equitable across campus. To allow a single individual that would be a faculty member to adjudicate or to help with these informal resolutions of what has happened and take some of the burden off the chair in a department by handling bullying within their department. Sometimes the chair has a conflict of interest sometimes the chair might be the bully. You are taking it away from that person and putting it in the hands of a trained individual who can then adjudicate the situation within the department. The type of thing that might happen there is you might get a reprimand of the faculty member, you might have somebody get their office relocated, that sort of thing is what would occur.

The possibility for dismissal would only occur in the most egregious cases that have gone before the faculty committee that has been investigated fully and then the recommendation would go to the Provost, the Provost would then send the recommendation to the Faculty Grievance Committee.

Another comment was about how it restricts freedom of speech. What the Faculty Welfare Committee felt was that we have to be concerned about the freedom of speech of the person being bullied. The person being bullied is having their freedom of speech restricted because maybe they are scared to come to work, they are scared to open their email, they are scared to speak in class, they are intimidated about speaking up in faculty meetings, maybe they are being excluded from faculty meetings, okay. Those people have a right to freedom of speech. They have a right to academic freedom that we hold so dear at this institution. This policy speaks for those people. It does not restrict in our opinion the freedom of speech of anyone because it is administered by faculty. It is administered by process – it is a process that we control, it puts a definition of what is and what is not bullying and it allows the faculty to set that definition and then to adjudicate the complaint in a faculty controlled manner. We are policing ourselves. That is the best method that the Faculty Welfare Committee and indeed the Faculty Senate could come up with in how to control workplace bullying which is in effect a very difficult complex issue.

The next point was faculty on faculty bullying and absolutely this policy only addresses bullying between faculty members. That is by choice because we are the Faculty Welfare Committee, we are the Faculty Senate and our job is to take care of the needs of the faculty. I agree that if we want to expand this to cover staff and everyone else on campus that would be great but that would take an enlargement of this policy to take into account Human Resources and would be a more complicated thing. Our hope was to get something passed for the faculty and then in the future it can be modified to include all people on campus but I totally agree with that.

The concept of sabotage was brought up and let me give you an example of the type of sabotage we are talking about here. So let's say that I am bullying a fellow faculty member and what I do is I call the federal funding agency that funds their research and I report them to the federal funding agency anonymously for not appropriately working on their grant for which they are funded. This initiates a full process from the federal government which causes that faculty member to potentially lose funding, causes that faculty member to go through all sorts of hassles with the federal government to maintain their funding. They have in effect have been sabotaged behind their back by their colleague. Now an act of sabotage is one action in a list of things that qualify for bullying. A single act does not constitute bullying. A single act of sabotage is exactly that – an act of sabotage it is not bullying. Bullying is a repeated intentional action against an individual – you are targeting an individual and you are taking action against that individual in a repeated way to intimate, harass and basically pursue psychological violence against that individual. That is what this policy is intended to do. If you're having a bad day and you yell at your colleague, that might be uncivil but that is not bullying. You could be the meanest person in your department, you could go around yelling at everyone and you are not a bully; you might be an uncivil person and nobody would like you but you are not a bully. You are a bully if you are intentionally targeting a single individual, you are recruiting individuals to join you, and you are targeting that individual to either drive them out of your department, to

drive them out of the institution, to drive them out of their career, you are targeting one individual repeatedly over and over again through every means you can imagine and that includes cyber bullying that includes everything you can think of that you can target at that individual.

So the policy itself was designed to create some flexibility for this committee of faculty members to adjudicate these difficult and most egregious complaints but to focus on the informal resolution through the University Ombudsman as is done currently or through the faculty civility advocate who would be somebody new that this policy would create.

PROFESSOR EVA CZABARKA (Mathematics):

The definition that the Committee Chair gave about bullying (and the fact that some of the bulleted items like "sabotage" refer to only those activities) should be included in any such documents - the way the document is right now allows for a much wider interpretation, which is dangerous.

Bullying is not a faculty issue only - not only faculty bullies and not only faculty is bullied. If this issue is addressed within the university community, it should be issued by a policy that includes the entire university community: faculty, administration, staff - everybody who works here. If we have a policy just for the faculty, this policy is dangerous, as it can be used as a tool against the faculty independently of the intentions.

If a university-wide policy is to be written, it should be inclusive to all types of harassment (bullying, sexual harassment, etc). We do not need separate policies for all of these issues.

I have one question you have mentioned earlier that this tends to start for a 3 month long discussion how will this discussion be conducted? How will opinions and questions be posted?

PROFESSOR KNAPP explained that we have a portal on the Faculty Senate webpage where the policies are posted. There is an opportunity for people to press a button and enter comments. He suggested that a public commentary would probably be more useful, and that the committee would investigate to see if one could be created.

PROFESSOR MOTT thanked the faculty for their comments, and for the thoughtfulness that everyone has put into the comments and into the development of the policy. He encouraged faculty to continue to email comments, suggestions for the definition of workplace bullying, or suggestions on the possible expansion of the policy to include groups other than faculty.

PROFESSOR KNAPP echoed Professor Mott's appreciation to the faculty for their input. The proposed changes to the Faculty Manual are already posted on the Provost's website, but will also be posted on the Faculty Senate website. The sites will include a mechanism for providing comment on both the policies. In principle, we would bring these to a vote at the next General Faculty meeting; however there is still plenty of time for discussion and amendment of these policies as presented.

PRESIDENT PASTIDES followed up on the comparison of the bullying issue to that of sexual harassment, noting that the difference with sexual harassment is that there is a federal code related to sexual harassment. The President learned that morning from our EEO Officer that, not at our University but at all organizations that accept federal funding, there are per day 275 reports of sexual harassment. Every one of those requires an investigation by a highly specific pathway. So our policy related to sexual harassment is virtually dictated by the federal government.

President Pastides noted the inherent asymmetry between the issues of sexual harassment and bullying, because bullying is not addressed by any sort of federal mandate. He agreed with the viewpoint that if there are issues of bullying in the University, it is likely not contained to faculty-on-faculty bullying.

The President thanked everyone for the civil discourse exhibited in the discussion, noting that it is an important problem, people are passionate about the issues, and there is some room for additional thought. He also thanked the Faculty Welfare Committee and Professor David Mott for shepherding us up to this point.

6. Old Business/New Business.

There was no old business or new business.

7. Good of the Order

There were no announcements for the good of the order.

PRESIDENT PASTIDES invited faculty members to a reception in the lobby immediately following the meeting. He wished everyone an opportunity for replenishment during the summer, and for progress on both personal and professional levels. The next meeting of the General Faculty will take place on Wednesday, September 4, 2013, at 2:00 p.m. in the Law School Auditorium.

8. Adjournment.

A motion to adjourn was seconded and passed.