

COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Minutes of the Collegial Assembly
Special Meeting to discuss proposed bylaws
November 29, 2000

Louis Raymon called the meeting to order at 3:30 PM. The following were present:

Biology	CIS	Geology	Mathematics	Physics	College Administration
Hillman, N.	Aiken	Anderson	Grinberg	Burkhardt	Hanna
Hillman, R.	Baram	Grandstaff	Hijab	Dubeck	Platsoucas
Sheffield	Friedman	Myer	Raymon	Gawlinski	
	Garrett	Nyquist	Reich	Hasan	
Chemistry	Korsh	Terry	Schiller	Intemann	
	Kwatny	Ulmer	Zitarelli	Lyyra	
Jansen				Mihalisin	
Stanley				Riseborough	
Wunder				Tan	

The Chair announced that although this assembly had been convened for a discussion of the bylaws, there would be an urgent item of business not related to the bylaws at the end of the meeting.

Materials distributed at the meeting included copies of the bylaws draft that had not been approved last year, a draft revision that had been undertaken in light of the discussion that occurred in last May's meetings, a synopsis of the differences between the two versions of the bylaws prepared by Leonard Garrett, and excerpts from the minutes of last May's meetings pertaining to the bylaws. As those minutes have not yet been approved by the Assembly, the Chair proposed that a motion to approve the excerpts would be appropriate. The remaining portions of the minutes will be subject to approval at the next meeting of the Assembly. A motion was so made, and passed by voice vote.

The Chair reported that the Executive Committee had developed the following procedures for adoption of the bylaws, and presented them as a motion:

1. Distribute the proposed bylaws at least two weeks before a vote is to be taken, in both the original and revised drafts. This has been done.
2. Decide, by mail ballot, which version to consider first.
3. In a second mail ballot, vote on whether to adopt the bylaws as selected by the first ballot. If the result of this vote is affirmative, the process is complete. Otherwise, in a third mail ballot, consider the remaining version.
4. At this meeting, it must be decided if the criterion for passing on the second ballot should be a simple majority or a two-thirds majority.

5. At this meeting, decide upon the rules regarding term limits to be inserted in the revised draft bylaws.

The motion, having originated in a standing committee, required no second, and was passed unanimously by voice vote with no debate.

Debate on the Criterion for Approval of the Bylaws

Anderson favored a two-thirds majority because it will give the document more weight.

Korsh said that he doubted that we would ever adopt any bylaws if a two-thirds majority were required, and therefore he favored a simple majority.

Garrett preferred a two-thirds majority, because that ensured that problems with the bylaws would be fixed before they were adopted.

The question was called, and by voice vote, the Assembly decided that a two-thirds majority would be required for the adoption of the bylaws.

Debate on Term Limits

The revised draft bylaws presented two alternatives regarding term limits, to apply to all elected committees of the college. The tenure and promotion committees, which are not elected committees in the revised draft, have one-term limits with no exceptions. The first alternative was a strict one-term limit for elected committees, and the second alternative allowed a second term on elected committees if there was a compelling reason that was approved by the Executive Committee.

Dubeck proposed a third alternative: no one shall be elected to a third consecutive term on any committee of the College. He noted that there are eight committees, and some departments are small enough so that frequent switching between committees would present a problem. Because this alternative applies only to elected committees, the Tenure and Promotion committees would still have strict one-term limits.

Garrett said that the preferred term limits decided in this meeting would be incorporated into the unrevised draft of the bylaws.

There was no further debate, and it was decided to select the preferred of the three alternatives by using an agenda by which the Assembly would decide which of the alternatives as presented in the revised bylaws was preferable, and the preferred alternative would then run against the two-term limit proposed by Dubeck. By voice votes, the two-term limit was selected.

Discussion of the Competing Drafts of the Bylaws

Raymon said that as he was involved in formulating the revisions of the bylaws, and would serve as an advocate for the revised bylaws, he could not moderate this discussion. The chair was taken over by **Dubeck**.

Garrett, who served as the advocate for the previous version of the bylaws, noted that the bylaws had been turned down two years ago, and revised, and

turned down again. All paragraphs of the old bylaws have been changed to conform to the new revision where the differences were not substantive.

The following presents the debate in dialogue form. It is not a transcript, but a reconstruction from the secretary's notes.

Friedman: Why was the composition of the Executive Committee changed?

Raymon: Members of larger departments are underrepresented, and have less voting power if each department elects a representative. Selection of three members by general election would give the Executive Committee a collegial view. Finally, the straw votes taken in May supported this alternative.

Garrett: Lou mentioned power. He means that if I'm the big department, I get two votes. Equal votes exist in the Collegial Assembly. Mathematics wants power in the committees.

Raymon: I used the word "power" in a technical sense, referring to a power index. The primary motivation for including at-large members in the Executive Committee is to promote collegiality and to avoid parochialism. In any event, the Mathematics Department comprises less than one-third of the College's faculty. Without support from members of other departments, no one from Mathematics will be elected to an at-large seat.

Garrett: In effect, Mathematics gets a second seat on the Executive Committee. I could live with a situation where the at-large representatives rotate from department to department.

Sheffield: The Executive Committee includes non-voting representatives from the Undergraduate, Graduate, and Budget committees, and ex-officio members from the Dean's office and Faculty Senate Steering Committee. Including at-large members makes it a pretty large committee. Will it be manageable?

Raymon: The committee works now. The non-voting members participate in discussions, and report to the Executive Committee. The committee functions better with the additional members. Furthermore, a person can be a regular member of the Executive Committee and represent a standing committee as well.

Garrett: I have been to only one Executive Committee meeting. I thought that the discussion would have been more open if the dean and associate deans had not been there.

Platsoucas: I originally had a policy of not attending Executive Committee meetings and Collegial Assemblies. Faculty members objected.

Reich: The Tenure and Promotion committees, in the newer version of the bylaws, are appointed. These committees are practically the final authority. Since they are not elected, a department's representative might be a person who did not represent the views of the department.

Raymon: The revised bylaws are intended to emulate the tenure and promotion procedures of the old CAS. These procedures worked. There is one change: each department is represented. It is not a good idea for elected committees to make personnel decisions.

Garrett: In CAS, there were cases of people receiving tenure without promotion. The Dean has his shot at promotion and tenure decisions, and the faculty should have an independent voice. There were cases in the School of Business where the Dean went against the departmental and collegial committee recommendations, and was reversed in the Council of Deans.

Platsoucas: The Tenure Committee makes the promotion decision for assistant professors without involving the Promotion Committee, so the problem that Len Garrett refers to will not occur. The faculty do have an independent voice in tenure and promotion — at the department level. By appointing the members of the Tenure and Promotion committees, power is shared between the Dean and the faculty.

Korsh: CIS has been in several colleges, and the Executive Committee in the Business School works best. The dean does not attend the meetings, and faculty members say what they want to say. The dean's presence in our Executive Committee meetings diminishes its effectiveness. The dean should have his say in promotion and tenure decisions, and he does. A strong faculty could still appoint good Promotion and Tenure committees.

Raymon: The dean's influence in appointing committees is exaggerated. He doesn't have veto power.

Garrett: There were problems in the past where associate professors were tenured without being promoted.

Platsoucas: This would not be a contradiction.

Korsh: The original version of the bylaws make it much more likely that the faculty voice will be heard.

At the end of the discussion, Louis Raymon resumed in the chair to present the first reading of a motion from the Undergraduate Committee:

Re-admitted students in CST who have not matriculated for more than 5 years are required to satisfy the current college and departmental requirements rather than the original college and departmental requirements that existed when they matriculated. However, re-admitted students can satisfy their original university (core) requirements.

Hanna said that there are dozens of applicants for readmission in the spring who will be affected by this motion, and an early resolution is needed.

Friedman asked if a three-year gap rather than a five year gap might not be more appropriate to trigger current graduation requirements. Hanna responded

that the committee had discussed a number of options, and selected this one. **Jansen** warned that the catalog now states the requirements for ACS accreditation, and if these change, students who seek accreditation will have to adjust their curricula, whether readmitted or not.

The second reading of the motion, with a debate and vote, will occur on December 13, 2000.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Bruce Conrad