

Minutes of the Faculty Meeting  
Willamette University  
College of Liberal Arts  
November 13, 2007

Dean Long called the meeting to order with bamboo sticks at 11:30 a.m., and 68 members were present at that time. More joined the meeting in progress.

Amadou Fofana led the meditation with the opening verse of the Koran, first chanting, then speaking, and finally translating into English.

The minutes from the Oct. 9, 2007, faculty meeting were approved without revision.

David McCreery: Faculty Council report

Retention, promotion and tenure files are being reviewed. Step increases will be examined next. David reiterated that letters need to be sent to Council in a timely manner. For future reference, personal statements do not have to be extremely long (5-10 pages should in most cases, suffice).

Chuck Williamson: Academic Council report

Council has been working in its Positions Committee mode; they hope to complete their recommendations by February. They will be looking at a draft opportunity hiring policy in the near future.

Grant Thorsett: Academic Programs

Grant thanked all for getting new course proposals submitted on time. He then called for the adoption of the report as a whole. Moved and so approved.

Keith Grimm: EthicsPoint Reporting System

Keith introduced the EthicsPoint system as an attempt to remove barriers to reporting serious ethical, legal or policy violations. (Powerpoint presentation is available for content on the Dean's webpage.) Willamette chose to include financial, HR and security/safety concerns only in its system.

Questions: Ellen Eisenburg asked about complaints lodged against faculty, since Faculty Council does not examine anonymous complaints. How does EthicsPoint alter current policies? Dean Long replied that the system is not intended for academic complaints. Keith Grimm replied that the Faculty Handbook would take precedence in faculty issues. Eisenburg asked about EthicsPoint being a separate system in place for violations. Cathy Whiting asked about anonymity, and her question was echoed by Meredy Edelson. Complete anonymity is a concern, and faculty asked if there was a requirement that a

complainant come forward. Grimm answered that the complaining person is instructed to check back in, so EthicsPoint does have some form of contact with the complainant.

Allison Butler asked about the wording for students to use the system; is the system for “employees” only. Grimm answered that this is not the case. Students can use the system, as is. Kelly Strawn asked about abuse of the system, and the real possibility of a malicious complaint. Sammy Basu asked about the supplementary nature of the system, as well. Is a new system essential if the current system is working? Grimm replied that Trustees feel they must provide all avenues to give voice to issues. Cathy Whiting asked about this system superseding traditional avenues. Don Negri commented about the good of classified staff being able to register harassment complaints, but iterated that a review of how this system will integrate with our current governance system be done. Todd Silverstein commented on the cost with Lewis & Clark as an example. Are we sure we need this system to ensure legality of a regulatory system, and are we sure it is worth the cost? Meredy Edelson asked about accuracy and validity of the processes: is there data in place to show this works? Only case studies exist. Ken Nolley commented about how there was consultation with admin council but not with faculty, with the suggestion that appropriate committees should have been used to put this in place and would have led to less questioning of the system. Dean Long will follow up on questions about the current faculty governance and this system, and Keith Grimm will meet with the Faculty and Academic Councils.

No new business or announcements

Moved to adjourn at 12:27 p.m. So approved.

Respectfully submitted,

Julianne Abendroth-Smith  
Faculty Secretary