

**Faculty Senate Minutes  
February 16, 1998**

Members Present: Anton, Beardsley, Bristow, Cooney, Hale, Kirchner, Lind, Maxwell, Sloane, Steiner, Barhydt

1. Minutes of February 2, 1998 - Due to the absence of Senator Hummel-Berry, the recording secretary for the meeting of 2/2, the chair suggested that any senator having additions or corrections to the minutes for that meeting send them directly to Hummel-Berry.

2. Announcements: Maxwell reported that there were 101 responses from faculty to the opinion survey regarding the use of student evaluations. These responses are now being analyzed and put into a format for first reporting to the Senate, and later to the campus community. When this ready Maxwell will request time on the agenda of a future meeting to explain the results. Later in the semester, the survey findings about faculty perceptions of the evaluation process, together with the results of the ad hoc committee's research into the issues of validity of student evaluations of teaching, will be used as a basis for making recommendations regarding to the senate about the evaluation process.

3. Chair's Report: Kirchner reported that Sloane will proof and edit the final version of the By-laws. Sloane will report any changes and corrections to Kirchner.

4. Discussion of the Bylaws amendment which substitutes the "Sturgis Code" for Robert's Rules to resolve parliamentary issues in faculty meetings. Kirchner pointed out that the two most significant differences in Stugis are (1) the replacement of the "Committee of the Whole" with a "Motion to Consider Informally", and (2) allowing a "Motion to Reconsider" to be made by anyone present, not just by someone voting on the prevailing side. Other differences are primarily editorial rather than substantive. Kirchner believes that the main advantage of Sturgis is that it is easier to read and use. Also, Kirchner reported that Sturgis is viewed favorably by the faculty parliamentarian, David Droge.

Beardsley raised concerns that the elimination of the Committee of the Whole will deprive the faculty of the report that Robert's requires. Beardsley's concern with allowing anyone to move to reconsider was that this could result in someone on the losing side to make ongoing motions to reconsider. Maxwell did not see this as a problem since the motion needs a majority vote to pass.

Bristow stated that she would be comfortable letting the full faculty make the choice when it is time to vote on the Bylaw amendments. She therefore recommended that we propose Sturgis and let the faculty discuss it.

**M/S/P (unopposed) that the Bylaws, Article III, Section 4. D., be amended to substitute the "Sturgis Code" for Robert's Rules of Order.**

5. The discussion then turned to considering the procedure to follow in presenting the Bylaws to the faculty.

M/S/P (unopposed) (Now that I think about it, I'm not sure there was a formal motion. Was there?) that Kirchner write a cover memorandum soliciting comments from the faculty. This memorandum and the Bylaw amendments will be distributed to all department chairs, with additional copies available in the Associate Deans' Office. Further, the memorandum and amendments will be posted on the university's web page.

There being no further business before the Senate, the meeting was adjourned at 4:34 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Keith Maxwell