CNS Faculty Senate Minutes  
October 22, 2010  4 p.m.

Present: Peter Berendzen, Kurt Pontasch (Biology); Aleksandar Poleksic (Computer Science); Chad Heinzel (Earth Science); Julie Zhang, Jin Zhu (Industrial Technology); Jihwa Noh, Suzanne Riehl, Nikolay Silkin (Mathematics); John Deisz (Physics); Jeff Morgan (Science Education); Joel Haack (ex officio)

Discussion of the draft bylaws of the new college

1. Article 1 (Membership in the Faculty). The senate discussed faculty levels included in the nonvoting and voting sets; the primary distinction is that permanent faculty members are voting, whereas others are nonvoting. While removing all “nonvoting” descriptors was suggested, the description was left as is.

2. Article 2 (Meetings). In previous drafts, the president and provost were given the ability to convene meetings of the senate; this clause was removed.

3. Article 3 (Jurisdiction). The senate discussed striking a statement regarding faculty participation in the formation of policies pertaining to faculty status; the consensus was to remove the statement.

4. Article 4 (Membership in the Senate).
   i. Biology objected to the one-senator-per-department membership in the new senate.

   ii. It was pointed out that representation based on department membership would create a senate of 30+ members, in the opinion of some too large of a body to be effective.

   iii. A compromise model, with a senate with one representative per department, but with multiple votes per representative based on department size, was suggested. Others questioned whether or not this was legal.
iv. Following further discussion, a straw vote was taken on the issue: One representative per department (6 votes); representative model (2 votes); abstention (1 vote).

v. The senate added a clause specifying that the members of the senate must be voting members of the College Faculty.

5. Article 5 (Officers)
   i. The senate discussed whether or not the chair and vice-chair should be one-year terms; as this is the CNS and CHFA model, the consensus was made to keep this format.

   ii. There was a question about who should elect the chair of the senate – senators or all members of the faculty? Consensus was that the election should happen within the senate. iii. The senate added a clause about the chair being a member of the voting senate faculty. (Currently, the science education representative does not vote, as this representative is also a member of another CNS department.)

6. Article 6 (Meetings). The chair clarified that although every other week is reserved for meetings, this does not mean meetings will happen during every available session.

7. Article 7 (Duties)
   i. It was suggested that during curriculum review periods, members of the “former CNS departments” should look at curriculum from those departments. It was pointed out that the senate has the power to appoint subcommittees that can address this without such provisions being formally included in the bylaws.

   ii. The senate removed the statement about the college senate serving as a liaison between the faculty and the university faculty senate; university faculty senate members should represent all faculty members without intermediaries.

   iii. The senate added a statement about its ability to adopt its own rules and orders when not otherwise specified.

8. Article 8 (Amendments)
   i. The senate clarified the first and second bullets to include
ii. The senate discussed whether or not rules of order should be specified, but decided to leave such out of the bylaws.

New college representation on university committees
Because the merged college will be larger than other colleges, do we want to ask for two representatives on university committees? Or do we want to have fewer university committee spots to fill and have just one representative per committee? (Also, is this a matter for the senates to decide, or one of the working groups?) No decision was reached on this issue.

The meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Respectively submitted,

Jeff Morgan Secretary