

Chair VerLinden called the special meeting to order at 4:04 pm on Tuesday, February 1, 2011, Nelson Hall East, Room 102 (Goodwin Forum). A quorum was present.

Members Present: August, Berman, Blake, Craig, Crowder-Fiore, Ellerd, Faulk, Flashman, Goodman, Heise, Kelly, Knox, Madar, Mola, Mortazavi, Moyer, Powell, Reiss, Rodriguez, Shaeffer, Snyder, Thobaben, VerLinden, Wilyer, Yzaguirre.

Members Absent: Altschul, Cheyne, Nordstrom, Richmond, Rizzardi, Tripp, Van Duzer, Whitlatch.

Proxies: None.

Guests: Burges, Paynton, Ayoob.

Chair VerLinden reminded senators that the purpose of the meeting is to focus on discussion of the draft documents presented by the expanded Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC). There are no resolutions or motions on the floor. The Senate needs to decide what will be sent to the General Faculty for a vote. Members of the Senate were asked to keep comments concise and relevant and to avoid long speeches.

Senator Knox led the discussion of the following six documents:

1. DRAFT "HSU University Senate Preamble (as of January 20, 2011) & University Senate Constitution"
2. DRAFT "Proposed University Senate Bylaws" (January 25, 2011) [up to Section 3.0 Elections]
3. DRAFT "Constitution of the General Faculty of HSU" (Draft changes as of January 20, 2011)
4. DRAFT "Background and Summary of Proposal Associated with Proposed University Senate" (February 1, 2011)
5. DRAFT FAQ (February 1, 2011)
6. Expanded FAC recommendation with regard to University Senate proposal and timelines"

Timeline: The FAC recommends delaying the timeline and having a vote of the General Faculty later this spring (March or April) and holding the election for new senators in the Fall of 2011. The new University Senate would be constituted in Spring 2012. This would allow for a full discussion of the proposals but still move the process along. The regular General Faculty election would occur this spring as usual.

M/S (Yarnall/Mortazavi) to adopt this recommendation. If the proposed changes are not passed by the General Faculty, then elections for vacant positions on the current senate will be held in Fall 2011.

Discussion:

- Q: Will the Fall 2011 election be for all new senators [on the proposed university senate] or will there be some who carry over? A: This needs to be discussed.
- Motion opposed – if the Senate is going to defer this, it needs to understand what it is deferring.
- Motion supported – this will give everyone more time to think about the proposed changes and for faculty to be as informed as possible before a referendum is held.
- Motion opposed – the drafts of the University Senate preamble, constitution and bylaws are not even close to being ready for a vote.
- It was suggested that current senators whose terms are up in Spring 2010 be asked to serve an additional semester (Fall 2011).
- Another option suggested was to allow even more time and have the referendum in Fall 2011.
- It was suggested that the FAC draft a precise motion and bring it to the next Senate meeting. The general sense is that more time is needed to work on the documents, but that action needs to occur in the next year.

M/S (Flashman/Mola) to postpone indefinitely the motion on the floor. There was no discussion, voting occurred and the motion **PASSED**, killing the pending motion.

DRAFT “HSU University Senate Preamble (as of January 20, 2011) & University Senate Constitution:

Discussion/Comments:

Section 5.5 – The Parliamentarian: Clarification was requested on whether or not the parliamentarian advises the presiding officer or advises the body (the Senate). [Note: according to Sturgis, the parliamentarian advises the presiding officer.]

Section 4.11 – Ex-Officio Members: Why is the Provost the only ex-officio member listed with “or designee”? It was recommended that “or designee” be removed; there were no objections.

Section 4.13 – Union representatives: Union representatives should not be voting members of the Senate. Discussion:

- Concern has been expressed in the past that it is demeaning and reduces the voice of senators if they are appointed as non-voting, ex-officio members
- The Higher Education Code makes a clear distinction between the role of the Academic Senate and the role of bargaining units. It limits the scope of bargaining unit representation – while they have the right to consult and be consulted, they should not vote on academic issues
- This discussion has already occurred on the floor of the Senate and it there was general agreement that it wasn't appropriate to have union representatives voting on the Senate – why has it been put back in?
- It was put back in based on feedback from the community at large; is the Senate opposed to having both union representatives (faculty and staff) voting members of the senate?
- The legal language needs to be consulted
- Senate business should be independent of the unions.

Section 4.11 – Ex-Officio Members: It was recommended that the Vice President for Enrollment Management and Student Affairs and the Vice President for Academic Affairs be included as ex-officio, voting members instead of an Academic Dean and one MPP appointed by the President. There was no objection.

It was noted that there is no alumni representation on the Senate.

The expanded FAC is proposing a 'delegate body.' Proportional representation has never been proposed. The intent is to create a deliberative delegate body that can have work brought to it by smaller bodies with diverse representation.

Section 4.2 and 4.211 – Elected Members: The numbers were questioned and will be corrected.

Section 5.1 – Chair of the Senate: Is it necessary for the Chair of the Senate to have had two years experience serving on the University Senate? When is that experience to have occurred?

Section 5.3 – Secretary of the Senate: Some of the duties outlined in this section should be assigned to the Senate Chair and the Senate Office staff. The Senate Chair should be responsible for setting the agenda for the Senate, in consultation with the Senate Executive Committee. The Secretary of the Senate is the Chair of the Academic Policies Committee – which is a full-time job.

- The Senate Constitution can't create a job description for a staff position.

- The language is okay – it states that the faculty member will ensure the work is done, not that they will do it. The Constitution (or Bylaws) does need to specify who develops the agenda.
- Given that the Secretary of the Senate will be not expected to perform any ‘secretarial’ duties, can the position be re-named? There were no objections to changing the title “Secretary” to “Chair of the Academic Policies Committee (APC).”
- Does the Senate want to have only two officers? There have been times when a third officer (or third in line) has been needed.
- It was suggested that the Chair of the APC be designated as the third in line to fill in for the Senate Chair.
- Would be helpful to include a more explicit list of Senate Chair duties and/or the phrase “and other duties as necessary”? Duties of the Chair include representing the University Senate at various university functions and serving as an ex-officio member on other university groups. The Chair is the official representative of the Senate for university business.
- Does the Chair of the Senate need to have three years at the university and two years on the Senate? Three years at the university is important. It was suggested inserting “ideally” before two years experience on the Senate.
- It would be preferable to have a Chair ‘in training,’ i.e., a Chair-Elect and remove the qualification of two years experience on the Senate. How would this work if the Vice Chair of the Senate is elected by the Senate and the Chair of the Senate is elected by the General Faculty?
- It was noted that succession of a Vice Chair is not automatic. [However, succession of a Chair-Elect is.]

Senators who have ideas for draft language were encouraged to send them to Senator Knox.

Chair VerLinden requested clarification from the Senate to determine whether or not members were in favor of extending the timeline for this process. The general consensus was yes.

Preamble: Section 3.0 – Special Meetings of the General Faculty: This section does not allow for the Chair of the Senate to call a meeting and it only addresses Senate business. It was suggested that a cross-reference be made to the section in the General Faculty Constitution which outlines the process for calling General Faculty meetings for the purpose of discussing other general faculty business.

Section 6.5 – Faculty Session: It was suggested that the faculty needs to have a mechanism in place for meeting in Executive Session. It would not be needed very often, but faculty need to be able to speak freely on controversial issues without fear of retribution.

Provisions for Executive Session need to be in compliance with the law; it is usually reserved for personnel matters, for example, discussion of the faculty award nomination.

Faculty session for discussion on Appendix J, etc. might be needed, but there is no reason it cannot be open. For example, discussions of changes to Appendix J occur at the Senate level, but recommendations can only be approved by a vote of the General Faculty.

Section 6.0 – Meeting and Quorum: Under 6.4, can a senator yield the floor to a non-member?

DRAFT “Proposed University Senate Bylaws” (January 25, 2011) [up to Section 3.0 Elections]

The draft includes proposed committee membership and proposed new committees; Senator Knox asked senators to focus the discussion on the committees.

Section 2.2 – Executive Committee (EC):

- Why is there only one statewide senator on the EC?
- Why doesn't the President sit on the EC? Will the Senate Chair continue to sit on the University Executive Committee? The Provost is on the EC, which is more effective than having the President on it.
- The total membership of the EC is half the size of the senate; this is too large and unwieldy for the committee to function well. The proposed EC is larger because there are new/additional committee chairs that will sit on it and it also seemed reasonable to expand it to include staff and student members.
- It was recommended that the Vice Provost be removed from the EC.
- It was recommended that the Past Chair of the Senate be added to the EC.
- 2.212 – What is the FAC's thinking behind proposing two additional faculty senators on the EC? A: There has been a perceived disconnect between the EC and the Senate. It was thought that having individuals who are not elected officers of the senate on the EC might give it a broader voice. There may be occasions when the EC would act for the Senate; expanding the committee makes sense in this regard.

Senators were invited to send recommendations for who should or should not serve on the EC to Senator Knox.

Section 2.4 – University Resources and Planning Committee (URPC):

- This is a huge committee (16 members); if the purpose of the committee is to get things done (which it appears to be from the list of duties), it is too big to be functional.
- All of the senators on these committees will have to find time to serve on them, in addition to the weekly two hour commitment for the Senate.
- 2.51 – This makes the URPC sounds very paranoid. What is the intent here?
- 2.42 – The VPs for Enrollment Management and Student Affairs and Administrative Affairs should serve on this committee.

Section 1.11 - What does “unbiased, appropriate and reasonable ...” mean? How is this determined? Principles and criteria can and need to be established that speak to bias and reasonableness.

Meeting adjourned at 5:44 pm.