

## COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Minutes of the Collegial Assembly  
May 4, 2000

Louis Raymon called the meeting to order at 1:35 PM. The following were present:

Biology	Chemistry	CIS	Geology	Mathematics	Physics	College Administration
Amini	Douglas	Aiken	Anderson	Chein	Gawlinski	Platsoucas
Hillman, N.	Schiffer	Ingargiola	Myer	Conrad, B.	Hasan	Hanna
Rappaport, J.	Strongin	Koffman	Terry	Grinberg	Intemann	
Skorski		Korsh	Ulmer	Gutierrez	Lyyra	
		Kwatny		Hijab	Mihalisin	
		LaFollette		Mendoza	Neville	
				Ragunandanan	Yuen	
				Raymon		
				Reich		
				Schiller		
				Srinivasan		
				Thornton		
				Zitarelli		

### Approval of Minutes

The minutes of March 30, 2000 and April 3, 2000 were approved.

### Reports

#### Chair: Louis Raymon

There will be a second meeting, scheduled for 1:30 PM in Barton 140 on May 8. The Dean's report will be given at that meeting.

#### Faculty Senate Steering Committee: Orin Chein.

The College needs to elect replacements for members with expiring terms. We have 15 seats, down from 16 due to reapportionment. There are 11 CST representatives whose terms are not expiring, and this leaves four open seats for election.

As Chein will be on leave for the fall semester, a one-semester replacement must be elected to represent the College on the Faculty Senate Steering Committee.

#### Graduate Committee: Robert Aiken.

The Committee met on May 3 to formulate its recommendations to the Dean for graduate student awards for outstanding teaching and for outstanding research. Three students were identified for outstanding teaching, and three for outstanding research. The deadline for nominations for Dean's Fellowships was May 3. The Committee will meet next week to consider the nominations that have been received.

### **Budget and Planning Committee: Leroy Dubeck.**

There are a number of searches for new faculty underway. The College has tried to obtain authorization for additional searches, based on the increased enrollment, but has not succeeded in convincing the Provost to approve them. The BPC fully supports the Dean's efforts to do this.

Faculty recruitment entails renovations, and a need for additional space. The College has faced large bills for renovation expenses.

Enrollment looks good for the coming year

The University Budget Review Committee has not met all year. The big problem on the horizon is the University Health System, which lost \$41,000,000 last year. Marty Dorph predicts that this year's loss will be significantly less.

**J. Rappaport** asked about the cost of renovations. The Dean replied that cosmetic renovations were costing the College \$189 per square foot. The Barton B renovations will cost \$1,400,000 an increase from the original estimate of \$800,000. The electrical system on that floor will have to be replaced. The University is offering some relief by allocating additional monies for renovations from the Plan to Renew. This issue will be part of the dean's report for Monday's meeting of the Assembly.

The Chair asked if high renovation expenses were a problem in CAS. Dubeck replied that he could find no rationale for the costs. Similar jobs had vastly different costs. There was speculation that Facilities Management would charge portions of some jobs to the Plant Fund resulting in low costs, and overcharge for other jobs.

### **Old Business**

#### **Undergraduate Committee: Donald Neville**

**CST Grievance Policy Second reading.** The Grievance policy was distributed at the meeting and forms part of the official copy of these minutes. It differs from the old (CAS) policy in two respects: student involvement, and a restriction on the length of time that can elapse between the completion of a class and the filing of a valid grievance. There was no debate, and the policy was approved unanimously by voice vote.

### **New Business**

#### **Undergraduate Committee: Donald Neville**

**Minor in Geology First reading.** A copy of the minor requirements were distributed at the meeting and form part of the official copy of these minutes. Reich asked if the minor had existed previously. Myer replied that a proposal was supposed to have been

submitted to COI in the CAS, but there is no record of that occurring.

**Faculty Senate Steering Committee Representative** (to replace Orin Chein for the Fall 2000 semester). The Chair reported that he had received four nominations in advance of the meeting: **Frank Friedman, Giorgio Ingargiola, Elliot Koffman, and William Nathan**. There was no response to a call for nominations from the floor. These names will be placed on a mail ballot sent to all Presidential Faculty Members in the College.

**Representative Faculty Senate Nominations.** The Chair reported that of the representative senators whose terms were expiring, two had agreed to be renominated. The following nominations were received from the floor: **Edward Gawlinski** (Nominated by Michaelis) and **Tomasz Skorski** (Nominated by B. Conrad). Both nominations were seconded by the Chair.

The remainder of the meeting was devoted to a discussion of the Bylaws. **The Chair** asked for a member of the Mathematics Department, which had opposed the version of the Bylaws that was voted down, to present that department's view. With no volunteer to do so, the Chair presented that view himself.

The Chair reported that in a meeting at which the Chair could not be present the Executive Committee voted to schedule these assemblies. Two motions were to be considered: first, the bylaws should be presented for a vote without the article on the composition of the Promotion and Tenure Committee. At a later time, the Promotion and Tenure Committee article could be adopted. A final motion would change the requirement for adoption and amendment of the bylaws to a simple, rather than two-thirds majority. In a subsequent meeting, the Executive Committee reversed itself. The Chair pointed out to the Committee that the Promotion and Tenure Committee's composition was not the only controversial article. Several members of the Mathematics Department have been concerned that the committees, with the exception of the proposed Promotion and Tenure Committee, all consist of a representative elected by each department. In this way, the individual members of the larger departments have less influence on the activities of the committees than do the members of relatively small departments. While some members of the Executive Committee felt that this issue could not be resolved, and the issue would have to be settled by a majority vote of the Assembly, the Executive Committee decided to use this meeting of the Assembly to discuss alternatives for the composition of Assembly's committees.

A discussion among members of the Mathematics Department generated three alternatives for consideration. They were to apply specifically to the composition of the Executive Committee.

- I. Each department elects a representative. In addition to this, three at-large

members, with staggered three- year terms are elected by the Assembly. No two at-large members can be from the same department.

- II. The old CAS model: the Executive Committee produces a ballot with the names of two representatives from each department for which a seat must be filled. Voting is by the Assembly. Terms would be for three years, staggered.
- III. The Executive Committee consists of the six Department Chairs plus three at-large members elected as in alternative I.

**LaFollette**, referring to the proposed structures as "self-perpetuating monsters," claimed that power would be concentrated in the Executive Committee or Department Chairs. Power would be concentrated in the hands of the few. He supported the structure where each department elects its representative.

**Korsh** suggested a fourth alternative:

- IV. Departments would be grouped in three divisions of nearly equal size. Each division would elect two representatives.

**J. Rappaport** urged that alternative II. be eliminated because it is inevitable that each member will represent the interest of his or her own department.

**Mendoza** said that serving on a committee was for the good of the College, not to further the interests of one department at the expense of the others. J. Rappaport responded that unless we get an external advisory committee, it is inevitable that the representatives will push for their local interests.

**Dubeck** suggested that alternative II should be eliminated, because the chairs would be too parochial.

**Reich** suggested that there are too many committees. There should be fewer, smaller, committees.

LaFollette asserted that one department is huger than the rest, and could control all elections.

**Hijab** noted that the Mathematics Department was not dominating this meeting.

**Ulmer** stated that in a meeting with 50 present, 40 could take over.

**Raymon** responded that he had hoped that the committees would take a collegial view.

**Korsh** said that alternative IV meets the dual goals of one person one vote and of having departmental representatives.

**Schiffer** said that one of the problems in CAS was that larger departments without grants controlled policy. Representation should be based on department population and total department funding. Koffman said that the number of majors should also be counted in determining representation. An unidentified voice suggested that credit hours generated should be factored in as well.

**Dubeck** said that under alternative IV, the optimal division would be Mathematics, Biology, CIS, and Chemistry, Geology, Physics. LaFollette suggested

that an even split could be achieved by splitting departments. J. Rappaport added that Centers should be represented. Each Center or Department should elect a representative.

**Korsh** said that the dichotomy was one person, one vote against one department, one vote. No compromise is possible, and requiring acceptance by a two-thirds majority will prevent the bylaws from ever being adopted. They might get through by a simple majority. We should vote on the bylaws, minus the promotion and tenure committee. We will learn something even if they are rejected. Dubeck responded that compromise was in fact possible, and that Alternative I was a compromise.

**N. Hillman** asked how the three at-large members in Alternative I would be selected. Would each department be limited to at most one at-large member. In response, Raymon stated that nomination would be by the Executive Committee, and election by the College. Ach department would be limited to one representative.

**Korsh** said that if there are no bylaws, we will have to vote twice every time we want to create a structure. He added that he didn't consider Alternative I to be a compromise. Such a structure might be acceptable for a Promotion and Tenure Committee. Mihalisin responded that he didn't think Alternative I appeared to be the Evil Empire. Korsh said that the Executive Committee will get to decide whom you can vote for. J. Rappaport commented that the more people you get in a room, the less gets done.

**The Chair** proposed a straw vote. Each member was to identify his or her "most preferred" alternative from among I-IV. Each member was to also identify the alternatives that he or she considered totally unacceptable. After this vote was taken, it was proposed that the one department, one vote alternative from the proposed bylaws should be included. Since it was not included when the original vote was taken, the number finding that alternative totally unacceptable was recorded, but the number finding it most preferred was not. The results were:

Alternative	Totally Unacceptable	Most Preferred
I	3	18
II	11	6
III	Uncounted	0
IV	11	1
One dept, one vote	11	

Other suggestions were considered. To reduce committee work, the Executive Committee and the Budget & Planning Committee could be the same committee. There should be term limits of three years on the Promotion and Tenure, Executive, Budget & Planning, and Executive Committees. Service on the Undergraduate and Graduate Committees should be limited to two consecutive three-year terms. The charges to the committees should e reviewed. These will be discussed in the May 10 meeting.

**LaFollette** asked who prepared the list of alternatives I-III. **The Chair** responded that members of the Mathematics Department had done so, in response to a request of the Executive Committee.

**Korsh** moved that the CST-L listserv be open for posting by any member. This motion was tabled until May 10.

**Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 3:11 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Bruce Conrad