

COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Minutes of the Collegial Assembly
December 11, 2003

Dubeck called the meeting to order at 3:13 pm. The following were present:

| Biology | Chemistry | CIS | Math | Physics |
|----------------|----------------------|------------|-------------|----------------|
| Amini | Jansen | Aiken | Chein | Borovitskaya |
| | Krow | Garrett | Conrad | Burkhardt |
| Geology | Nicholson | Korsh | Hijab | Dubeck |
| | | Lafollette | Reich | Gawlinski |
| Myer | Dean's office | Wiesel | Schiller | Luehrmann |
| Nyquist | | Zilbermann | | Lyyra |
| | Jenkins | | | Meziani |
| | Platsoucas | | | Mihalisin |
| | | | | Riseborough |
| | | | | Romanov |

Dean's Report

The dean reviewed the current grant support and enrollment for the College. Annual total costs are now at the level of almost \$20 million, with about \$1.5 million in additional funding pending. This College also has the greatest increase in the number of majors. We have been given good enrollment contingency funding to cover the hiring of dean's appointment and adjunct faculty members.

New faculty recruitment is going well. Two hiring packages for new presidential appointment faculty in CIS have been submitted to the provost. Another two hiring packages for presidential Mathematics faculty members will be submitted soon. Searches for two presidential faculty members each for the Chemistry and Biology departments are in process.

The Core

Dubeck urged all faculty members to participate in the University Faculty Senate meeting on December 18 at 1:30 pm. The main item of agenda for that meeting will be a first reading of the University Core Review Committee's proposal.

Chein urged coordination. Any amendment proposed by this college's faculty should be specific. We should not submit multiple competing amendments to address the Senate Steering Committee's mandated decrease in the number of core mathematics courses required.

Aiken asked the reason that the Steering Committee did this, negating the recommendation of the Core Review Task force. Chein noted that some majors were squeezed for time. The case for mathematics courses was poorly presented. Aiken said that we should clearly delineate the content of the two proposed mathematics courses, and explain why they it is beneficial for undergraduates to include them in the required core curriculum.

Gawlinski, speaking as a member of the Core Review Task Force, noted that the Task Force had strongly supported the inclusion of two mathematics courses in the Core curriculum.

Bylaws

A proposed new set of bylaws for the Collegial Assembly was presented. Several amendments were offered, viz.

Promotion/Tenure Chein noted that there is a conflict in responsibilities of the Promotion and Tenure Committees: do both consider the case when a faculty member is considered simultaneously for promotion and tenure¹? An amendment was offered to add the following phrase at the end of Art. XVI, section A: *except for those who are simultaneously being considered for tenure*. The effect of the amendment is to give the

¹Article XV(A) specifies that the Tenure Committee shall consider and make recommendations for all tenure cases, including cases where "A faculty member of the College is a candidate for a promotion that implies tenure." However, Article XVI, section A, which delineates the jurisdiction of the Promotion Committee, specifies that it shall make recommendations regarding promotion to all ranks . . . Thus the case of an assistant professor who is a candidate for simultaneous tenure and promotion would be considered by both committees.

Tenure Committee sole jurisdiction in cases where a faculty member is a candidate for promotion *and* tenure. This amendment passed by voice vote.

Faculty Responsibility Committees Referring to Article XXI, section 2 of the proposed Bylaws, **Krow** distributed an amendment to replace the provisions for faculty responsibility committees. The referenced section of the proposed bylaws is a copy of the provisions for the appointment and operation of faculty responsibility committees from the Standard Bylaws. The Chair explained that this was done ensure that the Bylaws would be approved by the administration. The amendment constitutes an extensive modification that would require the scrutiny of University Counsel and would possibly cause the bylaws to be rejected by the administration.

Krow responded that his main objection was that the the first sentence of Article XXI, section 2, which states, “After consultation with the Executive Committee, the Dean shall appoint an *ad hoc* Faculty Responsibility Committee to investigate allegations of misconduct against a faculty member.” Krow’s objection was that the sentence seems to require the dean to appoint an FRC if allegations arise, even if, in the dean’s opinion, the allegations did not warrant an FRC investigation. He proposed a simpler amendment: to replace the above-quoted sentence with “After consultation with the Executive Committee, the Dean may appoint an *ad hoc* Faculty Responsibility Committee to investigate allegations of serious misconduct against a faculty member.” The alterations are emphasized with underlines.

Korsh asked if all colleges used the standard bylaws provisions for FRCs. The chair said that the CLA bylaws have different provisions.

Krow’s amendment, in the brief version, was adopted unanimously.

Appointment of promotion and tenure committees Korsh said that the voice of the committees should be independent of the dean’s; therefore, the dean should not be charged with appointing the members of the committees. The proposed bylaws specify that the members of the promotion and tenure committee members is done by the dean, after consulting the Executive Committee.

Chein said that we need College bylaws, and the faculty should vote

for them. Korsh agreed, but said that an amendment now would improve the bylaws. He then proposed the following amendment: *The promotion and tenure committee members are to be appointed by the Executive Committee, after consultation with the dean*².

Korsh's amendment passed by a vote of 12–8.

Lyyra and **Meziani** raised the question of why the new bylaws should be considered now. Why not wait for a new dean to take over?

The Dean said that this was not a new initiative; in fact, the committee to write the Bylaws was appointed last spring, and its membership was announced in the May 7 Collegial Assembly.

Adjournment The meeting adjourned at 4:04 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Bruce Conrad

²It was not specified where this sentence would be placed in the Bylaws. It was later determined that the affected passages were Article IX, sections C and D; the penultimate paragraph of Article X, section D; and the third sentence of Article X, section G.