

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

Monday, November 18

Senators Present: Beardsley, Farmer, Haltom, Hummel-Berry, Kay, Kirchner, Lind, Matthews, Maxwell, Nagy, Potts, Robertson, Smith, Steiner. **VISITOR:** Droge.

Minutes: The minutes of October 28 and November 4 were accepted.

Announcements: The secretary (B. Smith) announced that John Riegsecker and David Droge had been elected to serve on the special committee to revise the Faculty Code. The slate of nominees for FAC are: K. Rousslang, B. Haltom and D. Share.

Chair's Report: The Chair reported that she had told C. Washburn that the Senate had declined to review the Academic Calendar unless there were conceptual changes. The calendar is therefore approved by default.

The Chair reported that at the next Trustees' executive committee meeting in December, she will discuss with the Trustees the issue of possible substantive revisions to the Code while it is undergoing scrutiny by the special committee.

CONTINUED DISCUSSION OF THE FACULTY BYLAWS:

1. How to break tie-votes in Senate and other committee elections, a problem that has been handled on an ad-hoc basis in the past. There was minimal discussion on this issue. Possible solutions include run-off elections, the addition of an extra name to a slate (as in the case of FAC).

ACTION: The Senate agreed to propose a bylaws addition to resolve ties by flipping a coin.

2. Should we have mail-out ballots or the possibility of voting by proxy when a significant issue is on the floor of the Faculty meeting?

There was a great deal of discussion on this issue because the Senate recognizes that faculty frequently have classes that conflict with scheduled faculty meetings.

The discussion centered on three items:

1. Can we eliminate the conflicting schedules by developing a university schedule that has an hour built in for Faculty meetings? The consensus was that such a solution would be ideal, but several senators voiced doubt about the possibility of finding such a time given the already existing difficulties with scheduling. In the end it was decided that G. Kirchner will contact John Finney to discuss this problem.

2. Should we allow for voting by proxy? This suggestion met with little favor.

3. The question of vote by mail-out ballot took up most of the discussion. B. Lind pointed out that this practice was employed within relatively recent memory of the institution and could be instituted in a Faculty meeting with

a majority vote. There was some concern that a mail-out ballot would contribute to a lower attendance at faculty meetings and that people would be voting without having heard the discussion. The response was that much discussion already occurs via e-mail and therefore the faculty could be quite well-informed about the issues on which they were voting. There was also discussion about how to interpret the existing language in the By-laws (Art. III, Section 2 E) which makes no specific provisions for mail-out ballots. In the end the Senate decided to put forward a formal motion regarding procedure to allow for mail-out ballots.

ACTION

MOTION: M/S/Passed

To add to the Senate's proposed amendments to the Faculty By-laws the following revision of Article II, Section 2 E: "Voting shall be by acclamation, or by the call by two (2) members of the Faculty for a secret ballot, or for balloting outside the meeting, when a majority vote of those present at the meeting approve such a ballot."

The Senate adjourned at 4:50.

The next meeting of the Faculty Senate is scheduled for Monday, December 2 at 4:00 PM in the McCormick Room.

Respectfully submitted,
Ili Nagy