FACULTY JUDICIAL COMMITTEE
YEAR-END REPORT
2010-2011

Committee Membership

A. Bonnett (SAS), A. DiGregorio (LIB), A. Dodd-Nufrio (SOE co-chair), K. Flynn (LIB co-chair), A. Forti (SOB), D. Glodstein (SOB), K. Greenberg (SAS), L. Hai (SAS), N. Hegde (SAS), C. Lange (SOB), Z. Madurka (SAS), F. Malkin (SOE), F. Millan (SAS), L. Park (SAS), D. Quarless (SAS), T. Savas (SOE), J. Spadaro (LIB), D. Sukhram (SOE), A. Tiscornia (SAS), R. Yamamoto (SAS).
Background and Charge of the Committee

In the spring of 2008, the Senate Bylaws Working group on Judicial Process was assembled and charged with the task of developing a proposal to create a faculty judicial committee. The proposal was ratified by the Senate in the spring of 2009, and the Faculty Judicial Committee (FJC) was established as a standing committee of the Faculty. The main functions of the FJC are 1) to provide a pool of trained faculty to serve as faculty representatives during formal Judicial Board Hearings, and 2) to serve as a source of continuing input and feedback to the Judicial Officer regarding the effectiveness, efficiency, and fairness of the College's judicial process as a whole.

Meetings

As stipulated in the Bylaws, the Committee met twice during the year, once during the fall semester and once in the spring.

9/8/2010 – Fall meeting – As this is still a relatively new committee, the meeting began with a review of the Charge of the Committee from the Faculty Bylaws. Next the issue of co-chairs for the committee was addressed. One of the co-chairs from the previous year was no longer a member of Old Westbury's faculty and the other co-chair stated that she was unable to continue in that role due to other commitments. A discussion ensued regarding the logistics involved in taking a vote for two new candidates. A combination of mail and electronic mail were used for the vote and by October, the cochairs
had been selected. Also under discussion was the issue of establishing a procedure for members who are unable to attend the hearings they were schedules for.

4/26/2011 – Spring meeting – This meeting began with a review of those members whose terms were ending in spring 2011. We were to be faced with 11 vacancies on the committee. As of this writing, all the vacancies have been filled. The members were reminded that two or three volunteers will be needed for the 2011/2012 academic year to work with the Judicial Officer and others on a revision of the Code for Student Conduct. There was continued discussion of an alignment between the consequences for misconduct and the learning experience. Whereas the theory is supported by all, the Judicial Officer cautioned us to keep in mind the monitoring and timing aspects.

Assessment

In the summer and fall of 2010 there were 131 reported incidents of misconduct involving 232 students.

The result was 17 College Judicial Board Hearings which were attended by 15 of the 20 members of the Faculty Judicial Committee. In the spring of 2011, there were 239 students involved in 114 incidents of misconduct. There were 14 College Judicial Board Hearings attended by 15 of the 20 members of the Faculty Judicial Committee.

Due to a number of different variables, some members are called to serve more than others. The disparities are as obvious as they are random. The ratios for this year are as follows:

# of times served	# of members
0	1
1	5
2	3
3	5
4	4
5	2

Two issues arose last year which we tried to resolve this year. The first issue comes from the inequity in service as made clear by the above indicators. The second issue is a procedural concern for members unable to attend a hearing for which they were scheduled. These issues were discussed in the fall 2010 meeting and a procedure was introduced that we anticipated would resolve both issues.

The procedure for a member unable to attend a hearing for which they are scheduled, is to first notify the Judicial Officer and then send a notice out to the membership requesting another member to cover the hearing. Those members who have not yet served or have covered only one hearing are encouraged to respond to these requests thereby satisfying the immediate need for a replacement faculty member on the board and helping to balance the service obligations per member.

A third, more complex issue is still in the discussion phase. Many of the members would like to see the sanctions given for misconduct serve as an educational experience for the student. There are however, many obstacles to implementing such an arrangement. In most cases an additional faculty or administrative person would have to be involved in order to monitor the student. Timing is another consideration. For example, assigning a student to help get ready for Panther Pride week would not be practical if the infraction occurs in December. While we all agree we should seize this opportunity to provide positive input, the number of variables makes it a challenging proposition.

Overall the committee has proved helpful in having faculty available so that a timely hearing date can be provided to students. Knowing the consequences of their actions allows students to make plans for going forward with their education. The intent of the Old Westbury judicial system is not to dispense punitive measures but rather to provide the opportunity for a learning experience that will help develop a responsible citizen.

Respectfully submitted by
Kathie Flynn and Arleen Dodd-Nufrio (co-chairs)