

The following is the fourth installment reviewing Dean Doty's memorandum in response to our grievance.

Why does Dean Doty expound on 8.2.9 in paragraph 3? It is the only issue stated in our grievance he feels he can remotely argue. The other five grievances he can only say "you assert no violation" without the least bit of evidence or reasoning. So, why expound on 8.2.9?

Here Dean Doty defines University advisory bodies to specifically exclude Chairman Carter's meeting to install himself as sole administrative authority in EFIB. Some faculty members were informed that the meeting was to be an administrative review and evaluation of two of the duly elected governance committee members. As part of the evaluation and review, Chairman Carter declared Drs. Lindley and Klinedinst not trustworthy to partake in the governance of EFIB. Chairman Carter then implemented an artificial procedure to select himself as the sole administrator of EFIB in the guise of following procedures of the Faculty Handbook and a questionable legal interpretation. Although many of the faculty did not realize it prior to the meeting, the meeting was a University advisory body that reviewed and evaluated Drs. Lindley and Klinedinst's suitability (trustworthiness) to continue membership in EFIB governance. For Dr. Doty to claim that meeting was not for the purpose of taking personnel action is at best disingenuous.

Consistent with Dean Doty's tendency to neologisms is his tendency to conveniently define terms to suit his predetermined conclusions. Documents like the Faculty Handbook are subject to interpretation. Keep in mind, however, that any administrator with Dean Doty's inclinations can render the Faculty Handbook meaningless. I'm sure Dean Doty can say we are interpreting the Faculty Handbook, too. The difference is we offer our interpretations and the facts that support them for review. We are willing to subject our ideas to a broad criticism. We can learn from our readers and in turn breathe life into a Faculty Handbook, while Dean Doty's interpretations are rendering it meaningless.

So, do our interpretations withstand scrutiny? Let us know. When all's said and done, isn't that the academic way?

The question faculty must contend with is do they allow administrators to pervert interpretations of the Faculty Handbook rendering it meaninglessness? That's your choice—for each and every one of you. But be very clear, inaction, sitting back, watching, doing nothing, or merely contemplating it "in the abstract," you contribute to creating an administrative instrument—not a university—you want.

Marc DePree