

COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Minutes of the Collegial Assembly
April 3, 2000

Louis Raymon called the meeting to order at 1:00 PM. The following were present:

Biology	Chemistry	CIS	Geology	Mathematics	Physics	College Administration
Sheffield		Aiken Baram Friedman Garrett Ingargiola Korsh LaFollette Lefkovitz Poe Stafford	Anderson Myer Nyquist Terry Toran	Chein Conrad, B. Raymon Reich Schiller Srinivasan		Platsoucas Hanna

Old Business

Undergraduate Committee: Robert Stafford

Second reading of a motion to approve the proposed BS, BA, and Minor in Information Science and Technology (IS&T). A copy of the program description was distributed at the meeting and forms part of the official copy of these minutes. **Ingargiola** asked about the mathematics requirement for the BS degree. Stafford responded that it was Mathematics C073, C074, or C075 (according to placement), followed by Mathematics C067. **Schiller** pointed out that Mathematics C075 is a core level B course. Stafford said that the program still required course C067. Schiller agreed that the mathematics department must work to design a better sequence of courses for this major. **Nyquist** noted that in the program description, the first paragraphs of the syllabi for courses CIS 0109 and CIS W301 are identical. **Friedman** said that this was due to clerical error: the first paragraph of the syllabus of course W301 should be removed. Ingargiola stated his objection that the mathematics requirement for the BS degree is too weak, with only a single class past algebra. Thus a student could get a BS in IS&T with only a single mathematics course at the university level. Schiller confirmed that Mathematics C073 is material that is supposed to be taught to high school sophomores, and that Mathematics C074 is also at the high school level.

The question was called, and the motion carried by voice vote.

New Business

Undergraduate Committee: Robert Stafford

First reading of a motion to adopt an Undergraduate Grievance Procedure. A description of the procedure was distributed at the meeting, and is part of the official copy of these minutes. Stafford presented the proposal as a slight modification of the CAS grievance procedure. The modifications involve the a statute of limitations. A grievance must be filed with the department ombudsperson by the end of the first month of the fall or spring semester following the semester in which the course that is the subject of the grievance was taken.

The grievance procedure has three stages: the first is an attempt to resolve the grievance with the faculty member through the good offices of the Ombudsperson. The second stage is an appeal to the Department Chair, and the third stage, which is engaged only if the grievance is unresolved by the earlier stages, is a hearing by an *ad hoc* CST Grievance Committee. The Grievance Committee, to be appointed by the CST Executive Committee, consists of three student members, chosen from the pool of ombudspersons, three

faculty members, and a representative from the Dean's Office. No member of the Grievance Committee can belong to the Department where the grievance originated.

Garrett asked why the statute of limitations was so restrictive, and suggested that grievances should be allowed up to the end of the semester following the one in which the course was taken. **Hanna** responded that the student only had to file the grievance with the ombudsperson within 30 days. Once filed, there was no limit on the time taken to finish hearing the grievance. The purpose of the statute of limitations was to avoid having to deal with old grievances brought up by students as a way to prevent their dismissal.

By-laws

Korsh asked the Chair about the status of the by-laws voting. The Chair responded that the vote was proceeding. There was a question about the eligibility of administrators who have Presidential appointments in CST departments to vote. In the vote on the By-laws options A or B, regarding the method of selecting members of the promotion and tenure committees, these individuals were disqualified, but the outcome would not have been affected by their votes. The Executive Committee had charged the Chair to consult Art Hochner for TAUP, and University Counsel about this question. In the current election, the administrators will be disqualified if and only if both sources give unequivocal opinions that they should be disqualified. It was not possible to have the assembly consider this, because there was not time for adequate notice. Art Hochner gave the opinion that since the administrators do not belong to the University Faculty Senate, they cannot vote. Counsel said that membership in the Union is irrelevant to this issue, and that the administrators were, by virtue of their presidential appointments, University Faculty Senators. They therefore are members of the assembly. With these conflicting opinions, the conclusion is that the administrators' votes are to be counted.

Intra-university transfer.

Chein noted that the Undergraduate Committee had formulated a motion regarding transfer to CST from another school, and had expected that it would have a second reading at this assembly. **The Secretary** responded that the Executive Committee was not aware of this motion, and it was not on the agenda. It will be placed on the agenda of the next meeting of the Assembly, when it can be considered along with the second reading of the Grievance Procedure.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 1:22 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Bruce Conrad