

Faculty Senate  
Feb. 18, 2008 4 p.m.  
Birkeland Lounge

Faculty Senate passed the first of two motions endorsing revisions to bylaws and articles of the Faculty Constitution and tabled the second pending further revision for language and content.

On unanimous voice vote, Senate passed the following motion: *That Faculty Senate endorse the changes to the Articles of the Faculty Constitution as described in this document* (for document, see the Agenda for Feb. 11).

Senate tabled the following motion: *The Faculty Senate endorses the changes to the Bylaws of the Faculty Constitution as described in this document* (for document, see the Agenda for Feb. 11).

.....  
Senate resumed discussion from its Feb. 11 meeting with Section 8 of the Faculty Bylaws. Dean Mark Krejci asked Senate to study two handouts, one revising Section 9 of the Articles for consistency of language, and another revising the name and charge of the Off-campus Programs Committee.

Susan Larson (Chair, Psychology/SCC) reported the thinking of the Senate Coordinating Committee about feedback from senators at the Feb. 11 meeting concerning elimination of the Curriculum Coordinating Committee. At that meeting, Linda Johnson commented that reassigning part of its charge—overseeing the curriculum and considering curricular trends—to the Curriculum and Core might overburden these already-demanding committees. Larson said SCC was not convinced that we need separate committees to take up those charges. In the past, she said, Curriculum Coordinating Committee has assigned those charges to task forces. SCC thought these charges should remain in Core and Curriculum Committees so that there is a Constitutional mechanism for dealing with curricular issues. She said that since the college now has a division chair overseeing core, we have an administrative mechanism to initiate the evaluation and review of the core curriculum.

Cynthia Carver (Division Chair, Professional Programs and Communication Studies/CSTA) recommended not deleting a graduate student representative from the Graduate Programs Committee. She said it would be wiser to allow for student representation, even if it went unfilled, than to have to yet again amend the Constitution should the need for such representation arise.

Michelle Lelwica (Religion) said it makes sense to eliminate the Professional Development Coordinating Committee, but she wondered if reassigning its charges to the Professional Growth Committee might make that committee overly busy.

In response to questions from Hank Tkachuk (CSTA) and Jim Ageson (Division Chair, Arts and Humanities; Religion), Krejci said that the Professional Growth Committee would not be overly burdened if its charges were spread out over the year.

In response to a question from Susan O'Shaughnessy (Philosophy), Susan Larson clarified that faculty benefits cannot be decided single-handedly by the Professional Growth Committee, but that SCC felt it important to ensure faculty participation in deciding benefits had a place in the Constitution. When the Professional Development

Coordinating Committee had the charge of developing and monitoring plans for employee benefits, it did not have sole jurisdiction, either.

Discussion then turned to the revisions of Section 11, Judicial Boards. Krejci noted that another revision would be forthcoming. This revision would eliminate the College Conduct Board and the Student Appeal Board; it would rename the Student Responsibility Board the “Student Conduct Board,” which would hear and act on alleged violations of social or academic integrity. This board would convene in cases wherein students deny the charges against them. Should students admit the violation but disagree with the sanctions, they could appeal to the dean of the college and, ultimately, to the president.

Tkachuk asked if having only one committee to hear cases of both academic and social integrity violations would overburden the committee. Lois Cogdill (Dean of Student Development) said she thought it would be workable.

O’Shaughnessy said she was concerned that if board members heard both kinds of cases, some board members would not be trained about “the nuances of plagiarism.” example, plagiarism.

Cogdill said adequate training of board members about what constitutes academic violations is most important.

Linda Johnson (History) spoke against the elimination of the Faculty Appeal Board, which is charged to “hear and act on appeals by faculty involving dismissal for cause.” Johnson said that eliminating the board would also “eliminate one level of appeal before a court of law,” and that assigning the charge of hearing appeals to the Promotion, Tenure and Evaluation Committee might overburden that committee. Further, she said, if the PT&E committee had been the original body that decided against a faculty member, it would be unlikely to reverse its own decision. She said that although the Faculty Appeal Board rarely meets, when it needs to do so it plays an important role.

Tkachuk suggested that the Senate Coordinating Committee might hear faculty appeals. Heidi Manning (Physics/SCC) commented that SCC is not necessarily comprised of the most senior faculty.

Tkachuk said that if we decide to retain the board, we language to suggest it be comprised of senior, tenured faculty. Johnson said she thought it important that faculty members who serve on the Faculty Appeals Board be tenured, but that rank is not as important.

Jonathan Steinwand (English) suggested that members of PT&E should be tenured full professors.

Krejci asked for an advisory vote on keeping the Faculty Appeal Board; the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

Carver asked SCC to clarify the language of Article 7.3.6 to eliminate confusion about the terms of service of committee chairs.

Krejci reminded Senate that the bylaw and article revisions will be voted upon by the Faculty of the Whole, and that we will need a quick turnaround when it comes time to vote for committee chairs and members.

Manning reminded senators to read the Constitution revisions carefully, as amendments are not considered at Faculty of the Whole meetings.

Tkachuk moved to table Motion #2, revisions of the faculty bylaws, pending further revisions of content and language. The motion to table was approved by unanimous voice vote.

Senate approved Motion #1, revisions of the faculty articles, by unanimous voice vote.

Senate adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Catherine McMullen  
Faculty Secretary