

Consider the second installment reviewing Dean Doty's memorandum in response to our grievance. He wrote, "In summary, you have failed to present objective evidence that provisions of the Faculty Handbook were violated." (Decide for yourself whether Dean Doty's claim is accurate. See our grievance, pp. 2-4. Evidence for claims in the grievance includes documents written by Drs. Carter and Doty.)

We agree that objective evidence should be provided for important decisions. Furthermore, we practice providing objective evidence for our positions. Here's what Dr. Doty should do. Review the documents that Dr. Carter provided for describing his resignation. They are enclosed with our grievance. Now apply the Objective Evidence Doctrine to Dr. Carter. Where did Dr. Carter provide any evidence that Tom Lindley or Mark Klinedinst were untrustworthy to maintain confidentiality? Dr. Carter provided no evidence, no support whatsoever that Drs. Lindley or Klinedinst had or would violate confidentiality. (Decide for yourself. See Dr. Carter's Memorandum dated September 19, 2006.) Then Dean Doty affirmed Dr. Carter's decision to reverse the duly elected governance committee, an important decision for which Dr. Carter had no evidence for the sole reason he asserted for resigning and then conducting another election, the untrustworthiness of Drs. Lindley and/or Klinedinst. (See Dean Doty's September 21, 2006 email to Dr. Grimes.)

Here is a principle the Faculty Senate could weigh in on without assessing our grievance in favor of any particular view. The Faculty Senate, and even the provost and president could affirm an Objective Evidence Doctrine. As a matter of fact, it is included in the Faculty Handbook. (For example, see 8.4.3 in the Faculty Handbook.)

Now compare the Objective Evidence Doctrine with *Dean Doty's* Minimum Sufficiency Doctrine. Dean Doty is on firm theoretical ground advocating the Objective Evidence Doctrine, even though he does not practice it himself. The Minimum Sufficiency Doctrine is Dean Doty's neologism and its meaning resides in his mind. Dean Doty practices the Doctrine of Minimum Sufficiency and merely advocates the Objectivity Doctrine.

Now, here's an example of the primary difference between Dean Doty and us. We can present our views for public consideration. We can participate in a dialogue and learn from others. We are not invoking a "minimum sufficiency" for confidentiality and hiding what we do behind it. In other words, Dr. Doty's ideas and actions cannot withstand public review.

Marc DePree