

On Being George Carter: A Reaction to the Statement

George Carter's "Prepared Statement" to EFIB, 9/19/2006

The 45 Minutes document showed us that certain individuals are writing about public faculty information in an uncomplimentary, derisive, and hurtful manner.

The last time we checked, Farhang Niroomand is paid more than is Corky Palmer. We can criticize Palmer for losing a *game* but we can't say anything about Niroomand spending tens of thousands of taxpayers' dollars in a wasteful manner?

The question rises, therefore, about what those individuals would write should they obtain private faculty information.

George, are you saying that the two duly elected committee governance members other than yourself are untrustworthy? You called them out as such in front of about 20 of their colleagues. Was that proper?

Consequently, I have seriously reviewed my responsibility for protecting private faculty information (such as your annual evaluations, student and parental complaints, and other sensitive material). Much of this sensitive material is known only to me as chair. When I resigned as chair before, I disposed of it, and I will dispose of what I have when I resign as chair this time.

George, what happened right before you resigned the last time? Oh yeah, you and your superiors had to terminate your assault on Trellis Green's attempts to get his promotion to associate approved. You and your cronies, using Option 3 – Chair only governance, violated the college handbook in denying Green a promotion. Let's not forget that one, okay? Oh, and when are you going to resign "this time?"

The election of an Option 2 Department Personnel Committee (a committee of two faculty members plus the chair) means that I must now release private faculty information to additional individuals. I am concerned about wider dissemination so I consulted the University Counsel.

George, why even invoke the 45 Minutes document to lay a foundation for your artificial "dissemination fear?" You could've gotten that so-called fear just as

easily from eating a bad ham sandwich. Let's get real. Everyone knows that was posturing.

His opinion is that the Faculty Handbook policies require me to release such information to Option 1 and Option 2 committee members, and I will do so.

In addition, the Faculty Handbook policies require an independent assessment by the chair on Annual Performance Reviews, regardless of option. I will be most comfortable if my independent assessment is prepared independently of the Committee. I, therefore, resign from the Option 2 Committee.

George, you make \$125,000 a year. Why do you think that is? It's not for your research. You make that much because you have to be *un*comfortable at times. Do you want your big 6-figure income and your comfort too?

This leaves the Department Personnel Committee without the required chair member. The University Counsel's opinion is that, with my resignation, the department faculty must now explicitly address the Department Personnel Committee choice. Since Option 2 (two faculty members plus the chair) is not a choice, the faculty must choose between Option 1 (three faculty members) and Option 3 (chair only).

So, you removed a choice yourself from the Faculty Handbook? Too bad *Episcopal Life* magazine wasn't there for the meeting. They could have seen your ethics program in its full glory.