

**Berea College General and College Faculty Meeting
Thursday, April 27, 2000
Conference Room, Seabury Center**

President Shinn called the meeting to order at 4:20 P.M.

Duane Smith led the faculties in prayer.

I. President Shinn called for consideration of the minutes of the April 13, 2000, meeting of the faculties. Following a motion to approve and a second, Keels presented the following corrections: The first two sentences of item IV.D. should read “Browner . . .,” instead of President Shinn, and “She . . .” instead of He. For the last paragraph of item V.B., the spelling of Centre College should be corrected, and in line ten, R. Boyce should be corrected to “J. Boyce.” Hearing no further corrections and the question called, **the minutes were approved as corrected.**

II. In the time reserved for President’s Remarks, President Shinn briefly set context for prepared comments that he then presented. The text of this presentation, “Berea’s ‘Governance Crisis’—Initial Reflections,” is attached.

III. Delphia Canterbury presented the list of degree candidates for the May and September 2000, graduations. Following some corrections, it was moved and seconded that the corrected list of students, upon satisfactory completion of all requirements, be recommended to the Board for awarding of degrees. There being no discussion and the question called, **the motion was approved.**

IV. Stephanie Browner presented three items from the Executive Council for action by the faculty.

A. It was moved and seconded that Morris Dees and Scott Sanders be recommended to the Board for award of honorary degrees. There being no discussion and the question called, **the motion was approved.**

B. It was moved and seconded that William Stolte, Chester and Rosett Thigpen, and Danny Greene be recommended to the Board for granting of Service Awards. There being no discussion and the question called, **the motion was approved.**

C. It was moved and seconded to approve the proposal regarding the charge and composition of the Campus Environmental Policy Committee (Attachment 42). Browner circulated a note from the Executive Council that provided a brief explanation of the changes that had been made in the proposal following the faculty discussion of April 13. Ramsey asked about the meaning of “Ecological design.” Browner pointed out where this was defined in the text. There being no further discussion, **the motion was approved.**

Dawn Anderson requested that the agenda be modified to ensure that the proposal from the Student Life Council be presented for discussion, since the rules require that changes in governance be discussed at least one meeting prior to action. Taken as a motion, and seconded, the agenda was modified.

V. Bob Hoag presented for discussion proposed changes in the Student Code of Conduct (Attachment 38, circulated with the agenda of the meeting of April 13). Following the circulation of copies of the current Student Handbook, Hoag explained how the proposed changes would modify current policy. Keels asked about the language of item II.(B), which he thought suggested that only those acts committed with the intent to be offensive would be prohibited, thus lessening the authority of the College to act against nonspecific acts that might be perceived as offensive. Hoag agreed that such an understanding was the intent of the SLC. He pointed out that the prior faculty action returning a proposal to create a “Display Policy” had prompted their decision to narrow the definition of excluded acts. Wade asked if the policy on sexual harassment could also be made to apply to other forms of offensive behavior. Hoag explained that the sexual harassment policy affected only sexual harassment and was covered under B.(2). Hyleck asked if the policy would now exclude student artistic work that was intended to be offensive. Hoag noted that this had not been considered by SLC. Hughes expressed her concerns with a policy intended to cover only intentional acts. Powell asked for clarification of Section F, whether the policy was intended to cover student behavior on or off campus. This question led to considerable discussion and comment by several members of the faculty. President Shinn asked for a straw vote on the issue of whether the policy should cover students when off campus. A majority thought it should not. Schafer pointed out that the current Student Handbook page numbers listed in the proposal were incorrect. Holman pointed out the difficulties that could be associated with foreign legal codes, and with the problems associated with determining the status of Berea students when doing study abroad. Provost Boyce wondered if language might be found that could be sufficiently inclusive of “on-campus” for legitimate study off-campus under College direction without having to cover all students in all off-campus activities. Lahamer asked if policies of other colleges had been examined. Hoag explained that other college policies had been examined, but nothing definitive was discovered. Crowden wondered if it might be possible to restrict sanction for off-campus behavior to only those situations in which judicial action was taken. Hughes expressed concern about the language used to define the expectations toward the community in Part I. Bolin had concerns about the implications this policy might have on acts of protest by students. V. Burnside felt the College needed to be careful in placing sanctions on students as a result of legal actions, given the possibility of injustice on the part of the legal system. Hyleck wondered if something akin to a “reasonable and prudent clause” could be included in the language. Morris asked how the expectation for moral conduct was incorporated into the proposal. Hoag explained that this had been conflated into E.(4). He then asked for feedback on this policy, given that all visitation would now be closed door. A number of individuals raised questions and/or expressed concerns

about how this concern might be dealt with. Pearson proposed a straw vote on the permissibility of extramarital sex. President Shinn suggested an issue for wording, but several others also spoke to possible wording. No consensus seemed to emerge as to how to deal with this issue. The time set aside for this discussion having elapsed, President Shinn invited the members to communicate with Hoag their concerns, suggestions, etc.

VI. Dawn Anderson presented items from the Academic Program Council.

A. It was moved and seconded to approve the proposal to create a new course, PEH 120 Health and Physical Education for Elementary Educators (Attachment 36). There being no discussion and the question called, **the motion was approved.**

B. It was moved and seconded to approve the proposal revising the convocation requirement (Attachment 43). Anderson explained the changes that had been made in the proposal since the initial discussion of the proposal at the April 13 meeting. Crowden asked about the proposed timeline for implementation and then commented that he felt it inappropriate to reward students who currently have deficiencies. Anderson disagreed with this interpretation. Schmidt and D. Smith noted that students could still be placed on probation for Fall 2000, and they felt that this was punishment as restrictions do exist for students on probation. Pearce wondered if language could be used to ensure that students understand that they are enrolled in convocation. Some discussion then ensued about procedures. Pearce then shared some perceptions toward the policy expressed by a number of students. Weston asked why the convocation grade couldn't be P/U as in other classes that don't count toward graduation. Anderson and D. Smith both spoke to the reasons behind the decision to use A/F instead of P/U. Smith also added that they were attempting to create a more positive attitude toward convocations. Some question was raised about the language of part 5 of the proposal, which several members thought could be read to replace all regulations governing convocation attendance, including those affecting convocation cards. Anderson explained that this was not the intent of the proposal, which was solely meant to replace the current graduation policy of ten per term and rules affecting convocation probation. President Shinn directed that the minutes show that this was the intent of the proposal. The question called, **the motion was approved.**

On motion to adjourn, President Shinn so declared at 6:20 PM.