

## COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

### Minutes of the Collegial Assembly March 3, 1999

The meeting was called to order at 3:30 pm by Louis Raymon. The following members were present:

<b>Biology</b>	<b>Chemistry</b>	<b>CIS</b>	<b>Geology</b>	<b>Mathematics</b>	<b>Physics</b>
Gruberg	Dalton	Aiken	Anderson	Chein	Gawlinski
Hillman	Wunder	Baram	Hill	Conrad	Intemann
Sheffield		Friedman	Myer	Grinberg	Lyyra
		Garrett	Ulmer	Mendoza	Martoff
		Kapps		Nathan	
		Kock		Raghu	
		Koffman		Raymon	
		Korsh		Reich	
		Kwatny		Robins	
		LaFollette		Schiller	
		Mandviwalla		Szyld	
		Patnayakuni		Triantafillou	
		Poe			
		Sherif			
		Weiner			

The minutes of February 17, 1999 were corrected by replacing the sentence,

*The Teaching Academy is the equivalent at the search level to ATTIC.*  
with

*The Teaching Academy is the equivalent at the University level to ATTIC.*

This sentence appears in the first paragraph of the Executive Committee report. After the correction, the minutes were approved.

The remainder of the meeting was devoted to amending the proposed by-laws.

Anderson presented an amendment regarding the Budget & Planning Committee (BPC). The text follows.

add at the end of item 5)

*and provide an annual summary report to be distributed to the Collegial Assembly at the first regular meeting in the Fall term.*

add at the end of # 12

*The Budget Planning Committee shall attempt to meet at least once each month during the regular academic year.*

*Each year the Chairperson of the previous year's Budget Planning Committee shall convene a meeting of the new committee during the first two weeks of the Fall semester. At this meeting, the voting members of the committee shall select a Chairperson of the committee for the next year.*

Rationale:

The Budget Planning Committee can only carry out the mission statement outlined in items 1-5 if it meets regularly and is included in process of setting priorities.

This amendment passed by a show of hands. It was not necessary to count.

A compromise amendment on the structure of the Tenure and Promotion Committee was placed on the floor by Garrett, seconded by Friedman. This amendment was immediately amended, by striking the parenthesized clause

*(from the same department if possible)*

from the text to be inserted in the last paragraph of #9, and by striking the word *departmental* from the new paragraph to be put at the end of #9. Thus amended, the text of the amendment is as follows:

\* insert in line 1 of #9

*with the exception of the Tenure and Promotion Committee...*

\* insert as paragraph 2 of #9

*The Tenure and Promotion Committee shall be composed of ten members of the graduate faculty of the College, including one elected by each of the Departments of the College holding the rank of Professor and four at large members appointed by the Executive Committee of the College, at least two who hold the rank of Associate Professor. The subcommittee of Professors will consider all promotions to the rank of Professor and the granting of tenure to Professors. The entire committee will consider all other tenure and promotion cases.*

\*insert in last paragraph of #9 as the second sentence

*In the event that an appointed member of the Tenure and Promotion Committee is unable to complete part or all of his or her service on that committee, the Executive Committee shall appoint a replacement to serve during the originally appointed representatives absence.*

\*insert in next sentence

*or appointed*

\*in last sentence

lower case *r* and delete the word *Senator*

\*insert new paragraph at the end of #9

*Appointed members of the Tenure and Promotion Committee will hold three year staggered terms. The starting points and rotation of these positions will be determined by the Executive Committee. No department will have more than one appointed member. Appointed members cannot be members of the Executive Committee.*

\*combine # 16 and 17 with the following paragraph and adjust numbering

*The function of the Tenure and Promotion Committee shall be to consider and make recommendations regarding the awarding of tenure and promotion to all ranks of faculty of the college who are candidates for promotion and/or tenure. The subcommittee of Professors on the committee will consider all promotions to the rank of Professor and the granting of tenure to Professors that are not yet tenured. The full committee of Associate Professors and Professors will consider all other tenure and promotion cases. Members of the committee will recuse themselves when a candidate is from their home department on the principle that a person only has input at one step in the process.*

Rationale: This structure would combine the committees into one and maintain faculty control and responsibility. It would integrate Associate Professors into the decision making process. It would allow the Executive Committee to assure diverse representation on the committee. It would provide a broader viewpoint on difficult tenure and promotion cases.

**Korsh** proposed a further amendment to the Compromise Amendment, by replacing the last sentence of the paragraph intended to be combined with #16 and #17 with

*Members of the committee will recuse themselves **from voting, but not discussion**, when a candidate is from their home department on the principle that a person only has input at one step in the process.*

(Korsh's amendment inserted the text shown in boldface.)

**Martoff** opposed the Korsh amendment based on his experience serving on promotion and tenure committees. **Kapps** spoke in favor, noting that a person from the department would be best able to answer questions. If necessary, other members of the committee could limit the discussion. **Friedman** opposed, saying that the committee could address questions to the department if necessary. He cited a need to control the flow of information to the committee and to consider cases in a uniform manner. **Martoff** noted that if questions are necessary, the file is inadequate. A member of the Promotion and Tenure Committee should not be permitted to add to the file. **Sheffield** said that often, details are needed in addition to a written file. Someone is needed to answer these questions. In CAS, not every department could be represented on the Committee, so to level the playing field, members did recuse themselves from discussion. In our college, all departments are represented on the Committee; therefore the recusal policy can be modified. **Conrad** said that a member of the

Committee did not represent the department and might have a biased view of the case. **LaFollette** said that more information is better than less. The Committee should listen, but consider the source of the information. **Friedman** agreed with LaFollette to a point, but said that the information received from a committee member who happens to be in the subject's department would not necessarily be better than information received from the department as a result of a query. **Garrett** said that a person from the department would be best able to evaluate the quality of the journals in which the subject published.

After this debate, the question was called on the Korsh amendment, and approved by voice vote. The Korsh amendment was then defeated by a show of hands, with 12 in favor and 18 against.

The question of the Compromise Amendment on Promotion and tenure was called and approved unanimously. The Compromise Amendment was then passed by unanimous voice vote.

**Chein** proposed further amendments to remove some inconsistencies in the by-laws that resulted from the Compromise Amendment. The chart in #9 must be revised since there is now one committee. All references to the Promotion Committee or the Tenure Committee must be replaced with references to the Promotion and Tenure Committee. **Martoff** wondered if the provision for including associate professors on the Committee would necessitate further changes in other parts of the by-laws. Chein said he thought not. **Anderson** gave a list of the changes that he thought were necessary. **Koffman** moved that the ad hoc By-laws Committee should be empowered by the Assembly to review the By-laws as amended and rectify any minor inconsistencies. **The Chair** ruled a new motion to be out of order. Koffman restated his motion as an amendment to the Chein amendment; the Assembly then approved the Koffman amendment, and then the amended Chein amendment, by unanimous voice votes.

**Aiken** proposed two amendments on behalf of the Graduate Committee. Both amendments refer to #13.

1. In item 2, replace the word *curricula* with *courses and curricula*. This amendment was passed by unanimous voice vote.

2. Append a new item 7, to read

*To advise the Dean on budget issues relating to graduate education.*

**Korsh** asked if the Graduate Committee should be permitted to advise the Dean without first reporting to the assembly. Aiken responded that the Executive Committee had suggested that the BPC should also review the Graduate Committee's recommendations. He asserted that the Dean should be permitted to consult the committee.

After this discussion, the amendment passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 4:18 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Bruce Conrad