

Faculty Senate 10 April 2006

Senators in attendance: Barry Anton, Kris Bartanen, Nancy Bristow, Derek Buescher, Bill Haltom, John Hanson, Max Harris, Suzanne Holland, John Lear, Eric Orlin, Barbara Racine, Jessie Rowe, Ross Singleton, David Sousa, Peter Wimberger

Guests in attendance: Lipika Choudhury, Rachel Decker, Alyce DeMarais

Senate Chair Anton welcomed ASUPS representatives Jessie Rowe and Max Harris

Minutes of 27 March 2006 approved without cavil or emendation

Associate Dean DeMarais asked the Faculty Senate to extend ISAC for one year because 1) a main charge to ISAC – to develop guidelines and evaluate existing programs – remains unaccomplished; 2) ISAC will continue to “consider other issues brought to it [ISAC] by students, faculty, and staff” (Senate charges, Fall 2003); and 3) the ISAC should formulate recommendations for the Senate regarding the future distribution of ISAC responsibilities.

M/S/P unanimously – that ISAC be extended for one year.

Senator Orlin announced electronic, web-based voting for Faculty Advancement Committee and Faculty Senate via uVote system

Senate Chair Anton reminded all of the celebration of Chaplain Jim Davis’s service to the university on 26 April 2006 in SUB Rotunda 4:00 p.m.

Nominations for the Walter Lowrie Award for Sustained Service to the University were considered. Details of this discussion and its outcome were suppressed by order of Senate Chair Anton.

Senate Chair Anton then turned the assembled to the Faculty Senate’s self-assessment (foretold in the 27 Feb 2006 meeting of the senate). Anton noted that the By-Laws of the faculty demand periodic attention by senators to the structures and processes of faculty governance.

Issue One – Does Faculty Senate conform to mandates and authorizations in the By-Laws?

Senator Orrin asked whether the By-Laws’ directive that the Secretary of the Faculty Senate keep the minutes need mean only that the secretary should take care to pre-

serve copies. There was a consensus in the affirmative but no formal interpretation of the By-Laws. To Senator Holland's inquiry as to why the Secretary of the Faculty Senate should not take minutes, multiple senators answered that the secretary's running elections was enough.

Issue Two – Size of Senate

Senators discussed whether more senators might be advisable. Senator Lear noted that the Faculty Senate this year had barely made quorum at times and that the number of faculty might have grown enough to justify more senators. Senators wondered whether seats set aside for junior faculty or members of professional schools might be progress and why seats presently set aside made sense, but that discussion was truncated in favor of considering the By-Laws as they exist rather than as they might be amended.

Issue Three – Workload

Senators agreed that duty on the Faculty Senate was not particularly onerous but that concomitant tasks tended to accumulate around senate activities. Senator Holland observed that a passive senate was little work but a pro-active Senate could burden busy professionals. Senator Lear noted that emotional meetings this academic year had been wearing. Senator Bristow asked whether faculty senators ought to be excused from further committee work.

Issue Four – Faculty Senate Committees

Senator Wimberger conceded that faculty had over the years had feared the “stacking” of committees but hoped that the dialog between the Faculty Senate (through its executive committee) and the deans could continue to the advantage of all.

Issue Five – Voting by *Ex Officio*

Senators Hanson and Sousa favored voting privileges for *ex officio* members of the senate, but Senator Wimberger reminded the assembled that *ex officio* members do not vote on ISAC. Senator Haltom didactically intoned that he did not know where the belief that *ex officio* members ordinarily do not vote originated but that the parliamentary presumption was that *ex officio* members vote. Dean Bartanen recalled that students secured votes on the Faculty Senate via student leader and later Trustee Tom Leavitt; she pronounced the involvement of students a pride of the university. Senator Rowe saluted the symmetry that students, staff, faculty each and all should be voting members of ASUPS Senate, Staff Senate, and the Faculty Senate.

Issue Six – Role of the Faculty Senate

Senator Singleton inquired of common understandings of the role of the Faculty Senate relative to the faculty as a whole. Senator Orlin directed attention to Article 4,

Section 5, sub-section a of the By-Laws: The Faculty Senate decides for the faculty when the faculty are not in session. Examination of context made it clear to all senators that the faculty were in session when they were in plenary meetings of the faculty. Senator Singleton opined that Senate in Fall 2006 should consider a more imposing quorum for faculty meetings. Senate Chair Anton issued the ukase that it should be done.

The sheer spectacle of Senate Chair Anton's authority still reverberated throughout the library as shocked and awed senators adjourned their meeting.

Respectfully emitted,

Senator Wild Bill