

COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Minutes of the Collegial Assembly
February 17, 2000

Louis Raymon called the meeting to order at 4:05 PM. The following were present:

Biology	Chemistry	CIS	Geology	Mathematics	Physics	College Administration
Amini Khalili Rappaport, J. Sheffield	Jansen	Aiken Conrad, P. Friedman Garrett Ingargiola Koffman Korsh Lefkovitz Nosek Stafford	Myer	Chein Conrad, B. Grinberg Mendoza Nathan Raghunandan Raymon Schiller	Dubeck Gawlinski Intemann Lyyra	Platsoucas Hanna

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of November 11, 1999 were approved.

Reports

Dean: Chris Platsoucas.

The Dean introduced a statement in response to the discussion under New Business in the meeting of November 11, and summarized its content. The complete statement, entitled “**EXTENSION OF REMARKS TO BE ATTACHED TO THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 17, 2000 COLLEGIAL ASSEMBLY MEETING**” was distributed at the meeting, and forms part of the official copy of these minutes. He emphasized his surprise at some of the remarks made at that meeting, and declared that he would have stayed for this discussion if he thought his presence was wanted. He had left the meeting to allow a full debate, and in this he had followed the practice of the Dean of the Medical School at its Assembly.

Many of the statements made at the November 11 meeting were either inaccurate or misleading. The statement that there had been disagreements with the Biology Department about hiring was not in accord with the written recommendations of the search committees. No candidate who was not deemed to be qualified by the cognizant search committee was given an offer. The Neuroscience search committee did recommend that the faculty hired as a result of its search be put in a center named Neurovirology rather than Molecular Neuroscience, and this suggestion was accepted.

The former chair of the Chemistry Department stated that by failing to hire an analytical chemist, the Dean had put the Department’s American Chemical Society (ACS) accreditation in jeopardy. While it is true that the ACS had put the accreditation of the undergraduate program on probation, that was due to a failure of the Department to respond to a re-accreditation inquiry, and had nothing to do with staffing in analytical chemistry.

Complaints about the wording of ads in faculty searches are refuted by the high quality of the candidates that have been attracted in all of the searches. These searches are progressing, and the Dean said he intends to offer positions and get acceptances before June 30, 2000 — before another administration takes over. A meeting with the Provost is scheduled soon to discuss some of the particulars of searches not associated with the Plan to Renew, especially start-up funds and renovations.

Research grant support in the College has increased to \$8.1 million, from \$1.5 million as of July 1, 1998. This represents an increase in excess of five fold. With additional grant support, we can strengthen our graduate programs, making research assistantships available. The College has also been able to negotiate favorable terms with Facilities Management for the renovations in the Life Science Building: we are paying half of the amount of the original estimate.

The University is considering a plan to establish a "University College" at Ambler. The Ambler Dean would like to be able to have a faculty that belongs to Ambler. While we want to help Ambler to improve, there is concern that an Ambler faculty members would be second-class, like the faculty at remote campuses of Penn State. The Dean suggested a rotating faculty appointment would be more appropriate. He also stated that the College proposes to appoint an Associate Dean, as well as a Laboratory Coordinator for the Ambler campus. The Associate Deanship would carry with it a summer salary as well as an administrative supplement.

The Dean announced that the Board of Trustees had approved the purchase an NMR spectrometer for the Chemistry Department.

Chein referred to a report from Dr. Wisniewska, the Ambler Dean, and the President's response (available on President Liacouras' website). The report states one of its goals is to enable any student who wants to complete his or her degree at Ambler should have the opportunity to do so. He cited this goal as being significant for this College.

Graduate Committee: Robert Aiken.

The Dean has agreed to establish awards to recognize outstanding teaching assistants, on condition that equivalent awards for outstanding research by graduate students will also be established. The Graduate Committee was glad to comply with this condition. The first teaching awards will be made this semester, and in the fall semester, the first research awards will be given.

Budget & Planning Committee: Leroy Dubeck

The Budget and Planning Committee has recognized that the College administration is underfunded, and that \$2 million per year for three years is not enough to renew the College's research mission without creative financing. It has been working to find ways to make this case to the University administration.

Faculty Senate Steering Committee: Orin Chein

President Liacouras' retirement has sparked a major conflict in the Senate. The Senate was invited to provide one elected member to the Presidential Search Committee, who would accompany the Faculty Senate President (Ann Van Sant). As two faculty representatives would be outnumbered, and unable to reflect the entire faculty on the Search Committee, and the Trustees were unyielding in their limitation of the faculty to two representatives, the Senate voted to boycott the search and send no representative to the search committee. Ann Van Sant insisted that she would attend anyway, thus defying the will of the Senate. A recall election will occur unless she agrees to follow the Senate's instructions within twenty-four hours. Dr. Chein urged all faculty members to participate in the recall election if it should occur.

New Business

The M.S. degree in Information Science and Technology: Robert Aiken

The Graduate Committee has approved the degree. A description of the program as approved was distributed at the meeting, and forms part of the official copy of these minutes. The Executive Committee has recommended that since the program is a renaming of an existing degree program and involves no new resources, a second reading will not be necessary unless substantial amendments were proposed. As a motion placed on the floor by a standing committee, no second was required. There was no debate, and the program was approved by unanimous vote

Report of the ad hoc By-laws Committee: Leonard Garrett

By way of introduction, **the Chair** recalled that in spring 1999, the Faculty did not approve a proposed set of

by-laws. A new By-laws Committee was formed, and that committee has produced a new set of by-laws.

Garrett said that each department had one representative on the By-laws Committee, and it held weekly meetings in the fall 1999 semester. These meetings resulted in two changes from the old proposed by-laws:

- The adoption procedure, and
- The composition of the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

The Committee reached unanimous agreement, except on the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

The revised adoption procedure is to present the new proposed by-laws to the faculty in two weeks for a vote. There would be no opportunity for a second reading in which proposed amendments could be considered.

Rather than having separate promotion and tenure committees, the revised by-laws propose to have a single Promotion and Tenure Committee. It would be composed of six full professors, one elected by each department, and three associate professors to be appointed by the Executive Committee. The Committee was split on whether the Executive Committee should consult with the Dean before making its appointments, and left the decision to the faculty. The Committee therefore decided that the ballot should have two parts:

1. Adoption — a two-thirds majority would be necessary.
2. Choose between alternatives: the Executive Committee appoints three associate professors
 - (A) without consulting the Dean.
 - (B) in consultation with the Dean.

The Chair said that the adoption procedure had been discussed by the Executive Committee, which made two rulings: first, the adoption procedure as stated in the old by-laws had been approved by a vote of the Collegial Assembly, and could not be altered by the By-laws Committee; and second, the vote on the alternatives (labeled II above) must be made, and the results publicized, before a vote on adoption would be possible.

Garrett responded that the By-laws Committee had been charged to look at the by-laws, and amend them where necessary. Since the adoption procedure was in the old by-laws, the By-laws committee was free to amend it. He understood that some people might not want to vote for or against adoption before the document being adopted was fully known, and agreed that there could be two votes. An initial mail ballot would select one of the two options for appointing the associate professors on the Promotion and Tenure Committee, and a subsequent mail ballot would consider adoption.

The Chair ruled that the finished proposed by-laws must be brought to the Assembly for debate and possible amendment. He stated that to overrule the Chair, a two-thirds majority would be necessary.

Korsh said that the resolution charging the By-laws committee to revise the by-laws applies to the entire document. The Committee was to start from scratch, and rewrite everything, if necessary. He made a motion to overrule the chair, which was seconded.

Garrett expressed resentment on being told by the Executive Committee that the By-laws Committee was not to alter the adoption procedure after the fact.

Chein said he needed to know what was being voted upon, and asked why amendments, if there were any, could not be placed on the floor at this meeting.

The Chair said that amendments could be introduced, but that the By-laws Committee Chair had not asked for this. The motion last December envisioned that the proposed By-laws would be presented to the Assembly with possible amendment, followed by a mail ballot.

Chein asked if anyone had an amendment to propose.

Korsh said the adoption clause in the old proposed by-laws included the phrase "*these proposed By-laws...*" and therefore did not apply to subsequent proposed by-laws.

Gawlinski asked the Secretary to produce the December minutes. **The Secretary** responded that they were not immediately available.

Chein asked, "If the motion passed, does that preclude further discussion of the By-laws at this meeting?" The Chair responded that discussion of the By-laws was not on the agenda. Korsh added that presentation was on the agenda, and gave his opinion that the faculty members present have the right to discuss them. The Chair said that this discussion should come after the vote. **J. Rappaport** asked if this was a filibuster.

A vote was taken and **the Chair was overruled**, thus adopting the voting procedure specified in the revised proposed By-laws.

Garrett made the following motion.

The Executive Committee is authorized to send out ballots to select one of the following alternatives:

- (A) The Executive Committee shall appoint three associate professors to the Promotion and Tenure Committee, in consultation with the Dean.
- (B) The Executive Committee shall appoint three associate professors to the Promotion and Tenure Committee, without consulting the Dean.

When the result of this vote is determined, a second vote on adopting the By-laws shall be conducted forthwith.

The Chair asked if amendments were precluded by this procedure, and noted that a two-thirds majority was required to waive the rules.

Dubeck offered an amendment to Garrett's motion: replace the word *authorized* with *instructed*. This amendment was accepted as friendly.

Korsh doubted that a two-thirds majority was needed to waive any rule regarding amendments.

The Garrett motion, as amended by Dubeck, carried. There was no motion to waive the rules regarding amendments as suggested by the Chair.

Motions from the Executive Committee regarding communication with the Dean: Louis Raymon

At the November Assembly, the Executive Committee was instructed to formulate motions regarding ways that communication between the faculty and the Dean could be improved, and to present them for the consideration of the Assembly at its next meeting. The Executive Committee presented four motions, which were distributed at the meeting, and form part of the official copy of these minutes.

The Executive Committee Motions were adopted without discussion.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:07 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Bruce Conrad