

**Faculty Senate Minutes
February 2, 1998**

Senators present: B. Anton, K. Barhydt, B. Beardsley, N. Bristow, T. Cooney (ex officio), C. Hale, K. Hummel-Berry, J. Kay (ex officio), G. Kirchner, B. Lind, R. Steiner, A. Tiernan, A. Wood

Visitors present: M. Gardiner, T. Mace

1. Approval of Minutes: The minutes of January 26, 1997 were approved as written.

2. Announcements: There were no announcements.

3. Chair's Report: The chair had no items to report.

4. Discussion of Bylaws Amendments Regarding Duties of the Student Life Committee and Library, Media, and Academic Computing Committee:

Kirchner began discussion of bylaws amendments regarding duties of the student life committee by briefly recounting history of Senate discussions regarding this committee and its charges. She stated that faculty has experienced some ambivalence about the student life committee. While there had been a motion before the Senate to eliminate the committee, discussions at the time suggested a need existed for a committee with oversight, rather than full authority, over student life affairs. Kirchner reported that the scaled back duties in the revised version of the Bylaws may not meet the University's accreditation requirements. In Fall 1997, Bill Haltom was charged to draft language proposing bylaw amendments regarding charges for the committee consistent with an oversight role. In discussing these bylaw changes, Senators were working with Bill's draft language, provided in advance of the meeting by email, and with alternate draft language written by Judith Kay in response to Bill's email, also provided to Senators by email in advance of the meeting.

Because there were a number of proposed changes, there was a brief discussion about process in terms of whether the Senate would consider each change one at a time, or work through all changes then move to approve the whole document section at once. A decision was made to work through the proposed changes considering and approving each separately.

Section F, part b: In the draft revised bylaws, part "b" is called "duties." Haltom's draft suggested the wording "The Committee shall be authorized:" in place of the word "duties." Kay's draft used the same phrase as Haltom's draft.

Kirchner identified that the word "duties" is used throughout the Bylaws in sections dealing with other Senate committees, and suggested that there would be benefit in keeping the wording essentially consistent throughout the document, a concept that met with general agreement in the group. Beardsley pointed out that it is possible to use the word "duties" and still convey the message of committee choice regarding those duties by adding phrases such as "when and if necessary."

M/S/P (unopposed) To make all such language throughout the Bylaws consistent using the word duties.

The following items were then discussed in turn. All of them follow the heading "duties" (of the Student Life Committee.)

Item F,b,1: Draft bylaws version: To act as a liaison among students and faculty and the Dean of Students. Haltom version: To act as a liaison among students and faculty and the Dean of Students. Kay version: To act as a liaison among students and faculty and the administration.

Kay explained that she believes there is a perception on campus that Dean of Students has authority over all areas of student life and cocurricular life, but jurisdiction is actually limited. When the committee is

approached about matters concerning student life which are not within the jurisdiction of the Dean of Students, (such as facilities services matters) the committee needs to be able to refer to actual supervisors of systems when necessary. Beardsley suggested that some other phrase should be added so that the effect of this sentence is not to broaden the role of the Student Life Committee. Cooney suggested adding the phrase "on student life issues" after "liaison."

Revise wording of F,b,1 to read "To act as a liaison on student life issues among students and faculty and the administration."

Item F,b,2: Draft bylaws version: To serve in an advisory capacity to the Dean of Students. Haltom version: To advise the Dean of Students. Kay version: Recommends deletion of the item.

Kay explained that Bill's change was essentially editorial, but that she feels the item could be eliminated entirely since it is already implied as a function of the committee. Bristow stated she did not feel strongly about it one way or another, but feels that being explicit in general is useful since not every committee member will have detailed familiarity with bylaws. Kirchner recalled that a student life committee was at one time concerned about having that as one of its duties. Kay answered that the committee had not been so much concerned about the advisory role as with whether or not the committee should exist. Anton pointed out that when you place the faculty in the role of advisor you take away policy making authority.

(unopposed) to delete the passage currently numbered as 2, revising the following numbers as appropriate.

Item F,b,3: Draft bylaws version: Item deleted Haltom version: to review issues related to students whenever said issues shall be raised with the committee by one or more students, faculty, and/or staff, and Kay version: as deemed necessary, to conduct reviews and make recommendations about those policies and procedures that affect students' lives outside the classroom.

Kay explained that she prefers her proposed alternate wording because she doesn't object to the committee functioning as a place to bring concerns. She expressed concern that the word "whenever" tends to be too strong. She feels that the phrase "act as a liaison" in F,b,1 adequately expresses that role. Cooney expressed concern that the phrase "by one or more students, faculty, and/or staff" is not consistent with the current process of agenda building. He suggested that Kay's alternative wording might be a good middle ground in terms of bringing back the function which had been deleted in the draft Bylaws revision of addressing student concerns, but not introducing such unwieldy language about how those concerns become part of the committee agenda. Bristow pointed out that the language that Haltom had used followed from the phrase (F,b) "to be authorized" as opposed to "duties" so that the Kay language may follow more appropriately from "duties." Beardsley indicated that a concept of importance in the Haltom version might be that of bringing in the staff as sources of concern about student life, since they have understanding and experience on some of these matters which might make their bringing certain issues forward appropriate. He suggested adding staff to the list in F, b, 1 to address this.

(unopposed) add "staff" to F,b,1 with editorial refinements. Item then reads: "To act as a liaison on student life issues among students, faculty, staff and the administration."

Kay suggested that her version of F,b,3 is related to a phrase which follows this in her email, in that both phrases go back in a simplified way to recapture some of the duties which had been struck in the suggested deletion of the original Bylaws item F,b,3. (The phrase she referred to here was "as deemed necessary, to conduct reviews and make recommendations about co-curricular programs and services, and) Her attempt in drafting these additions was to distinguish between policies and procedures. Beardsley pointed out that Bylaws section 2, article 2 is fairly broad and gives faculty power with regard to student life. Cooney pointed out that the power given in that article is power of the faculty of the whole, rather than the committee. Anton asked what the phrase "as deemed necessary" refers to, wondering whether it would be necessary to have those words there at all. Kay explained that there may arise occasions when this committee might delve into a particular area that might not be a regular responsibility,

and it might be too great a burden to annually review every policy and procedure, even those that are functioning smoothly. Bristow questioned whether there might be a way to clarify the phrase. Kirchner indicated that the Bylaws seem to be silent on who makes charges, and asked for response on this. Cooney stated that the matter is complicated in terms of parliamentary procedure, in that committees are committees of the Senate, but the President is Chair of the Faculty. Kay asked if there was anyone who could not bring charges to this committee. Beardsley indicated that if someone brings a concern to any standing committee, and if the committee chooses not to deal with the matter, it is still possible for the faculty member or other individual to form an ad hoc committee to bring the matter forward. Thus the phrase could be left out. Cooney suggested that the passive verb might be the root of the problem, and suggested alternate wording.

M/S/P (unopposed): to adopt suggested phrases 3(Kay version), 4 and 5, now numbered as 2, 3 and 4 as amended, changing the phrase "as deemed necessary" to "as necessary" and adjusting the position of the phrase. These items thus amended read as follows: F,b,2: to conduct reviews and make recommendations as necessary about those policies and procedures that affect students' lives outside the classroom. F,b,3: to conduct reviews and make recommendations as necessary about co-curricular programs and services, and F,b,4: to perform such other duties as may be assigned to it.

Discussion then turned to the draft Bylaw revisions dealing with the Library, Media, and Academic Computing Committee.

Kirchner pointed out that the Bylaw section dealing with this committee is out of date, including the fact that it refers repeatedly to "academic computing." She asked Mike Gardiner for input on this section. Gardiner indicated that the committee discussed whether it should exist, and that while there was some sentiment for elimination of the committee there was also opinion that the committee serves a purpose when concerns do arise, though it does not have much work much of the time. The committee sees itself somewhat as a sounding board for the Associate Vice President for Information Systems, and somewhat as a means for faculty to raise concerns when they exist. Kirchner asked if the Bylaws as written describe the function of the committee as it currently perceives itself. Cooney indicated that the words "office of information systems" should generally be substituted for "academic computing" and suggested elimination of duties 4, 5, and 6. (These duties are "to review periodically the collection development plan for the library to ensure that a balanced collection is maintained for effective support of the academic program; to assess regularly library and academic computing services and to recommend appropriate changes; and to look ahead and help the library and academic computing plan the development and integration of their services, respectively.) Anton pointed out that duty #2 (to provide recommendations and advice to all parts of the University community on the role of the library, media and [academic computing] in support of the academic program) really limits this service to the academic program or whether the cocurriculum could be included. Cooney pointed out that in broadening this role, budget is an unanswered question. Kay suggested broadening the language to the term "educational program." Beardsley agreed with deleting 4,5, and 6, but suggested that 4 is an important enough part of duties and rights of faculty in section 2 of Bylaws that it might better be retained.

M/S/P (unopposed) elimination of duties 5 and 6 with retention of duty 4.

Kirchner returned to the question of the title change from "academic computing" to "office of information systems." Beardsley pointed to the problem of fluidity of titles over time, and suggested that it would be beneficial to word Bylaws such that they did not commit to a particular title. He suggested changing "academic computing" to "information systems" wherever these words appear. Cooney suggested retention of the word "media" because if eliminated the oversight of this might be lost.

M/S/P (unopposed): substitute the words "information systems" for "academic computing" wherever those words appear.

Kirchner asked for a volunteer to read through the changes in the Bylaws to check them. After an extended and reluctant pause, Sarah Sloane's name was suggested. Cooney brought up a loose end to

clear up which was the change in the parliamentary source from Roberts to the more recent manual by Sturgis that Kirchner had brought to an earlier meeting, because it seems to be easier to understand with minimal variation in rules as compared to the Roberts.

Substitution of the newer Sturgis for the Roberts as a manual of parliamentary procedure. Bristow expressed the concern that because this item had not been on the agenda, the campus community could not voice concerns, so it was decided to postpone dealing with this issue until it could be placed on a regular agenda.

Lacking further business, M/S/P: adjournment at 5:05 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Kathie Hummel-Berry