

Faculty Meeting Minutes

November 1, 2000

1. The meeting was called to order at 3:15 P.M. by Dean Curtis Johnson.
2. The minutes of the meeting of Oct. 11, 2000, were approved as presented.
3. President's Report

President Mooney announced the dates for additional faculty forum discussion meetings. They are: November 30, 2000; January 18, 2001; and April 12, 2001. He announced that Prof. Rottschaefer will produce notes of the first meeting for the benefit of those who did not attend. He urged the faculty to keep this discussion going and to attend as many of the subsequent meetings as possible.

4. Dean's Report
 1. A number of issues were circulated by the dean on e-mail and will not be repeated here.
 2. The dean reported on some issues under discussion in the Academic Council.
 - Parental-leave policy: The Director of Human Resources has been asked to examine three models for cost. The AC will discuss and ask departments for comments. It was pointed out that any policy on parental leave must be uniform at the college for all three schools.
 - Day care: This is a complex issue; any interested parties should communicate with Provost Atkinson who will be scheduling a public meeting to air this issue.
 - Presidential Commissions: The Commission on Teaching has been constituted with ten members and has had its first meeting. The members are: Profs. Clifton, Cox, Goldman, Grant, Grudin, Nelson, Savage, Schoeneman, Weeks, and Williams. The Commission on Academic Priorities has also been constituted with 16 members and is about to have its first meeting. The members are: Profs. Balmer, Beckham, Bierzychudek, Callahan, Dodds, Johnson, Lochner, Mandel, Owens, Smith, Rohrbaugh, Reiness, Schleef, Seeley, and Ward. Faculty are urged to communicate with the members of these groups with ideas and suggestions.
 3. Information on faculty salaries was distributed at the meeting with brief comments.

4. A Bathhouse task force consisting of Profs. Christensen, Glosser, Goldman and Kaplan will examine the possibility of using the bathhouse as a faculty social space.
5. Standing Committees.
 1. Curriculum Chair Steve Hunt reported that the Course-Proposal Subcommittee, headed by Stuart Kaplan is discussing whether grades below C and CR/NC ought to be allowed to satisfy department major requirements.
 2. Educational Technology Chair Erik Nilsen informed the faculty that the committee had distributed information on instructional software proposals.
6. Old Business

Dean Dinah Dodds was introduced and presented the text of a motion which had been introduced and seconded at the previous faculty meeting.

Motion to amend the Bylaws of the College of Arts and Sciences with proposed new language indicated by **bold** print:

Add the following to Article I. Faculty:

Section 1. Membership

Membership in the Faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences shall consist of tenured and tenure-track Faculty; **Lecturers and Senior Lecturers**; others teaching at least half time...

Section 2. Voting Rights

For purposes of Faculty business and elections, voting rights shall reside with tenured and tenure-track faculty. **Faculty holding the title of Lecturer of Senior Lecturer shall, upon application to the Dean of the College, also be received into membership of the voting faculty, with all associated rights and responsibilities, excepting membership on the Committee for Promotion and Tenure.**

Prof. Dodds then informed the faculty that as the maker of the motion, she had accepted a friendly amendment, suggested by Prof. Nelsen, that would remove unnecessary language that was redundant in the context of other language in the Bylaws. For example, the membership of the Committee on Promotion and Tenure is specified elsewhere in the Bylaws and would not be changed by this amendment.

Thus the revised text of Article I, Section 2 would now read [changes to the

above indicated in **bold**]:

For purposes of Faculty business and elections, voting rights shall reside with tenured and tenure-track faculty. Faculty holding the title of Lecturer of Senior Lecturer shall, upon **notification** to the Dean of the College **also have voting rights**.

Prof. Nelsen remarked that "application" was not in the spirit of the motion and that the intent was for Lecturers and Senior Lecturers who wished to attend and vote at faculty meetings to be able to do so and others who did not wish to attend faculty meetings need not attend.

The previous question was moved and seconded. A point of information was raised in which it was asked whether the motion would grant Lecturers and Senior Lecturers the right to vote to elect members of faculty committees, in particular, the Committee on Promotion and Tenure. The answer was that since this was not specified one way or the other in the motion that it would do so. The motion to close debate failed.

A motion to amend was then offered to make Section 2 read as follows [newly-added language indicated in **bold**]:

For purposes of Faculty business and elections, voting rights shall reside with tenured and tenure-track faculty. Faculty holding the title of Lecturer of Senior Lecturer shall, upon notification to the Dean of the College shall also have voting rights, **except for election of members of the Committee on Promotion and Tenure**.

The motion was seconded. Some history was given and a discussion on the merits and implications ensued. Questions were raised as to whether it was appropriate to craft an amendment to the Bylaws on the floor of the meeting without first checking for consistency with the Bylaws as a whole. The question of whether this new amendment constituted "important business," was raised. If so, then no vote could take place until the next faculty meeting. The Chair ruled it was not important business. A motion to appeal the ruling of the chair was made and seconded. The discussion centered on the merits of amending the Bylaws without a thorough checking for consistency. Advocates for the motion noted that delaying the vote to a subsequent meeting would allow for such a check.

The previous question was moved and seconded and passed. The vote on the appeal then passed, overruling the chair. Thus, the matter was declared "important business" and could not be voted on until the next meeting. Reinforcing the wisdom of the body, it was pointed out that this last amendment might be unnecessary thanks to language in Article 5. Section 5, which specifies the election of committee members. It was requested that in the future, important items be discussed over email and submitted in writing to the faculty along with the agenda and call to the meeting and that

submitting such important matters at the door did not allow time for adequate discussion and reflection.

A straw vote was held and indicated that a majority of faculty seemed to be in favor of the intent of the amended motion.

7. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:58 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,
Evan T. Williams
Secretary, Pro Tem