



11-19-2015

Faculty Senate Minutes Nov. 19, 2015

Missouri University of Science and Technology Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarsmine.mst.edu/facsenate_min

Recommended Citation

Missouri University of Science and Technology Faculty Senate, "Faculty Senate Minutes Nov. 19, 2015" (2015). *Minutes & Agendas*. 110.
http://scholarsmine.mst.edu/facsenate_min/110

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by Scholars' Mine. It has been accepted for inclusion in Minutes & Agendas by an authorized administrator of Scholars' Mine. This work is protected by U. S. Copyright Law. Unauthorized use including reproduction for redistribution requires the permission of the copyright holder. For more information, please contact scholarsmine@mst.edu.

Volume IX, Number 4
Minutes of the Special Faculty Senate Meeting
November 19, 2015

I. Call to Order and Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 1:30 PM by President Steven Grant and roll was taken.

Those whose names are grayed out below were absent.

Levent Acar, S.N. Balakrishnan, Stuart Baur, Martin Bohner, William Bragg, Michael Bruening, Joel Burken, Craig Claybaugh, Steven Corns, Michael Davis, Richard Dawes, K. C. Dolan, Fikret Ercal, Bill Fahrenholtz, Mark Fitch, Ralph Flori, Daniel Forciniti, Abhijit Gosavi, Barbara Hale, Lance Haynes, Amber Henslee, (Matt O'Keefe for) Wayne Huebner, (Michael Schulz for) Ulrich Jentschura, Kurt Kosbar, Umit Koylu, Gearoid MacSithigh, Audra Merfeld-Langston, Ashok Midha, Mark Mullin, Fui-Hoon Nah, Robert Paige, Otis Register, Ali Rownaghi, Chaman Sabharwal, Tom Schuman, Sahra Sedighsarvestani, Shoaib Usman, David Westenberg, Paul Worsey, Wan Yang, Maciej Zawodniok

II. Proposed amendment to the Faculty Bylaws (CRR 300.030)

S. Grant (60 mins)

Steve Grant explained the purpose of the meeting is to discuss the proposed amendment to the Faculty Bylaws; nothing else can be discussed. Dr. Grant then invited Mark Fitch to give the presentation. Dr. Fitch explained that in order for RP&A to present the proposed amendment for consideration by the General Faculty, it must have the support of at least twenty faculty members.

Professor Fitch highlighted the proposed changes, comparing them to the current bylaws. The following changes are in all proposed versions:

- General Faculty membership and Special meetings – Adds deans, specifies number of faculty who can call a special meeting
- Faculty Organization – Adds deans, adds requirement for meetings to be conducted under Robert's Rules of Order
- Colleges – specifies membership of college faculty
- College Meetings – specifies semester meetings and requirements for calling special meetings
- College Responsibility and Authority – establishes that General Faculty shall delegate responsibilities and authority to each College, which differs from the May 2015 version
- Special Programs – adds clause for approval by the dean in cases where the program curriculum is entirely within that college
- Graduate Faculty – adds deans to the membership of the Graduate Faculty
- Faculty Senate – add Chancellor as ex-officio member

- Standing Committees – adds deans, specifies that previous chair of standing committees organizes election of the new committee chair

Dr. Fitch went on to discuss the section related to a Dean Search, comparing this version with the May 2015 version:

- This version removes the word “advisory” from the search committee
- Each department elects a tenured faculty member to the committee (versus nominating three tenured faculty)
- The Provost may add members
- At least two-thirds of the committee will be composed of the elected tenured College faculty (the May version does not specify tenured College faculty)
- The search committee elects a tenured College faculty member to serve as chair (in the May version, the Provost selects the chair from three faculty nominated by the search committee)
- The search committee presents an unranked list of acceptable candidates (the May version specifies that the search committee present an unranked list of three or more acceptable candidates)
- The Provost recommends a candidate from the list for the Chancellor’s approval, or shall inform the search committee why the list is insufficient; the Provost may ask the committee to consider recommending additional candidates or may recommend that the search be extended (The May version does not include a provision for the Provost to request additional acceptable candidates).

There was considerable discussion of each of the proposed changes.

Professor Haynes posed a procedural question regarding how to appropriately encourage our colleagues to support the bylaws amendment this time. Dr. Grant stated that if a resolution is passed by Faculty Senate, that indicates that the issues have been discussed and it has the support of the Senate. Hopefully, the senators will report back to their department the actions and discussions held by Faculty Senate.

*Levent Acar moved to change the percentage of faculty necessary to call a special meeting from ten percent to twenty. The motion was seconded. **The motion failed.***

Barbara Hale indicated that she has already received support from twenty-two faculty for the proposed amendment as distributed prior to the meeting and posted on the website with the meeting materials. She pointed out that once the proposal has received the required support from twenty or more members of the General Faculty and the proposal is referred to the Rules, Procedure and Agenda Committee for presentation to General Faculty, modifications cannot be made.

Michael Bruening suggested that the word “comprised” used in the Dean Search Committee section be changed by friendly amendment to “composed” for grammatical reasons. The friendly amendment was accepted.

Tom Schuman commented that while the proposed amendment removes the Graduate Faculty member from the Campus Curricula Committee (CCC), *the CCC would prefer to retain Graduate Council representation.* Since the motion is coming from a committee, no second is needed. **The motion passed.**

There was further discussion of the composition of the dean search committee. *Professor Levent Acar moved to insert the words “of the elected” before “tenured College faculty” in the paragraph describing the percentage of faculty required to call a special meeting.* **The motion passed.**

There was further discussion related to whether the search committee should present a ranked list of acceptable candidates, rather than the unranked list as described in the proposed amendment. Professor Jerry Cohen was recognized to speak to the body. Dr. Cohen explained the rationale for specifying that the list be unranked, recounting a story in which a dean was told his ranking during a heated discussion with a faculty member. Mark Mullin also expressed his opinion that the list needs to be unranked noting that the committee is to put forth only those names they find acceptable. Tom Schuman pointed out that while the preference of the current administration is that the list be unranked, there is an expectation that the assessment of the individual candidates should be made clear in the committee’s report.

Steven Grant called for vote to get the sense of the Senate on keeping the “unranked” listing. **The motion passed.**

Daniel Forciniti commented on the definition of the word “acceptable,” expressing his concern that the actual vote of the committee is not made known to administration.

Kurt Kosbar and several other faculty questioned the advisability of limiting the number of candidates the committee could select. Professor Hale provided the background from Task Force discussions of the number of selected candidates, stating that the Provost had originally proposed three or more acceptable candidates. Professor Haynes suggested that the wording be changed to “an acceptable list of unranked candidates.”

A vote was taken on changing the wording to say “an unranked list of acceptable candidates.” **The motion passed.**

Lance Haynes requested that the body review the number of people on the Oversight Committee for the Grievance Hearing Panel. Professor Haynes suggested changing the number of members from three to five. Since this is in agreement with the current CRR 310.010, this friendly amendment was accepted.

Mark Fitch moved that the Faculty Senate endorse the proposed amendment as modified through this meeting. The motion was seconded.

A question was raised as to whether a vote to endorse the amendment would require that new signatures be obtained before presenting the proposal to RP&A. Dr. Fitch called

point of information that the CRR wording states that “Amendments may be proposed by twenty (20) faculty members”; it doesn’t specify signatures. However, since the motion on the table is “to endorse,” **Professor Fitch withdrew his motion.**

Professor Fitch moved that Faculty Senate propose the amendment as modified during this meeting, including the “sense of the Senate” votes. The motion was seconded. **The motion passed with 29 votes in favor with one abstention.**

Details may be found at the following links:

[Proposed Changes to CRR 300.030 by S&T Faculty Senate November 2015](#)

II. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 2:24 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Michael Bruening, Secretary