REGULAR MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

September 21, 1970

MINUTES

The meeting was called to order at 4:13 p.m. by President Olson. The following senators were absent:

Albert A. Branca	Franklin P. Kilpatrick	John W. Shirley
Mary K. Carl	Raanan Liebermann	Byron P. Shurtleff
William G. DeColigny	Francis J. Merceret	Edward A. Trabant
James B. Heck	William Pulliam	Laszlo Zsoldos

I. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Olson announced two replacements of senators: Barbara Kelly to replace Don Nelson for the Division of Physical Education and Athletics, and Charles W. Raymond to replace Frederick E. Roeming. He indicated that the Committee on Committees' Report would be ready for Senate debate on October 5, 1970. He announced the appointments of Messrs. Anapol, Williams, and Tingey to the Ad Hoc Committee on Rules. The President informed the Senate that the FPPC would report on suggested changes to the Faculty Handbook in the near future. He further indicated that it would be necessary for the Senate to fill two vacancies on the Judicial Policy Board. He read a letter from Dean Eddy requesting volunteers to serve as members of the Parking and Traffic Committee. Senators themselves may serve or make recommendations to Dean Eddy.

II. REPORTS

President Olson recognized Mr. Anapol, who gave the following report on the Speakers' Board:

The Speakers' Board has been organized as a sub-committee of the existing Cultural Committee. It has held two meetings (August and September) and will meet monthly in the future. The members are: (Faculty) Jim Soles, Political Science; Kevin Kerrane, English; Ed Stewart, Intercultural Communications; Malthon Anapol, Dramatic Arts & Speech; (Administration) J. S. Sturgell, Student Center; (Students) Sami Bandak, John Dickson, plus one additional student to be named.

The Board has been informed orally that its budget is to be $6,000 for 1970-71. The Board sees its role as aiding in coordinating appearances of speakers on campus and in assisting in maintaining a balance of speakers in regards to time of appearance and point of view.

Present projects include preparing a brochure listing all speakers due on campus the first semester and developing a program of guest speakers for the Winterim Program, a period during which no speakers are presently scheduled, to the best of our knowledge. During the spring semester the Board will seek to engage speakers who will cover areas and viewpoints not offered in the fall term.

III. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted as distributed on a motion by Mr. Brown seconded by Mr. Wriston.

IV. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. 1. Discussion then proceeded on the amendment to Section VIII, sentence 2 of paragraph 1 of the Constitution. This amendment would substitute "one-sixth" for "one-third," making the provision read: "One-sixth of the voting membership of the University Faculty shall constitute a quorum."

Mr. Crawford asked how many faculty members were required to constitute a quorum under the one-third provision. Mr. Wriston indicated that 206 faculty members in attendance were required during the past year to constitute a quorum. Mr. Lippert indicated that some faculty feel that one-fourth of the total faculty is a more appropriate quorum size. Mr. Williams was recognized and stated that the purpose of the Senate is to develop a smaller working group to reduce the number of faculty meetings. Changing the quorum size from one-third to one-sixth of the faculty for General Faculty meetings seems to be a duplication of effort. Perhaps it would be best to see how this system of regular Senate meetings with two General Faculty meetings works out before reducing the quorum requirements for General Faculty meetings. He indicated that he was against the amendment. Mr. Krum asked what happens when a quorum is not present at a meeting? How is a subsequent meeting called? Mr. Olson indicated that there was no provision for this in the Constitution. Mr. Hunt indicated that his colleagues prefer a quorum of one-third with the Senate as a working group. Mr. Brown suggested that the reason for the reduction in number to make a quorum was to make it more likely to get faculty business done. Mr. Osborne briefly indicated that he was in favor of the amendment. Mr. Anapol read a quote from Robert's Rules of Order and indicated that some reduction in the quorum size may be appropriate. Mr. Denn suggested that there may be some confusion here and he would be inclined to stick with the one-third requirement since Items (b) and (c) take care of the problem that Item (a) is addressing itself to. Mr. Comings indicated that he agreed with Mr. Denn's comments. Mr. Salsbury indicated that he was worried about lowering the quorum requirement in that this action seems to relieve the implied obligation to attend the faculty meetings. We should allow the current system to work for awhile. Mr. Schweizer moved the previous question, seconded by Mr. Crawford, passed voice vote.

Vote on the amendment to Section VIII, sentence 2 of paragraph 1: 19 ayes, 31 nays. The Senate does not endorse this amendment to the Constitution.

2. Debate on Item III (1)(b) of the agenda, which proposed to add the following sentence to Section VIII, paragraph 1: "In the absence of a quorum, the business on the agenda of the University Faculty shall be transacted by the University Senate at its next meeting."

Mr. Mosznyski suggested that perhaps there were two items of importance to consider here. The purpose of a Faculty meeting is to, first, hear reports of the Senate, and, second, amend the Constitution. This delegates the rest of the business of the faculty to the Senate. We are not interested in hearing our own reports and it is dangerous to allow the Senate to alter the Constitution. Mr. Crawford asked if the wording in the question forces

the Senate to accomplish the business of the Faculty meetings. Mr. Williams inquired if in the past, when a quorum was not present in a meeting, did not the President call another meeting and title it as the same meeting which had been called for which no quorum was present? Is this a legitimate procedure? Mr. Anapol replied that the procedure was legitimate. Mr. Lippert called the previous question, Mr. Wriston seconding. Question passed by voice vote.

Vote on Item III (1)(b) of the agenda: The Senate voted by voice vote not to endorse this amendment.

3. Debate on Item III (1)(c) of the agenda, which proposed that Section IX of the Constitution be stricken and replaced by the following:

This Constitution may be amended only by mail ballot of the voting members of the University Faculty. Proposed amendments may be submitted to the Secretary of the University Senate by an individual faculty member or groups of faculty members. In order to be submitted to the University Faculty, an amendment must be endorsed by a majority of the University Senate or signed by 25 voting members of the University Faculty. No proposals shall be voted on between May 15 and September 15. Amendments receiving a majority of the votes returned will be adopted.

Mr. Salsbury indicated that he liked the idea conveyed in this amendment because it had the potential to bring about the broadest faculty participation. Mr. McLaughlin suggested that a problem would arise in this situation in that it would be necessary to specify a quorum for a mail ballot.

Motion by Mr. Glenn seconded by Mr. Halio to submit the amendment to Section IX of the Constitution to the Senate Rules Committee. Passed voice vote.

B. The debate now moved to Item (2) of Unfinished Business concerning amendments to Section IV of the Constitution, Membership of the Senate.

Motion by Mr. Worthen seconded by Mr. Bonner to remove Item (2) from the table. Motion was defeated by voice vote. The amendment suggested under Item (2) remains tabled.

C. Discussion of the proposal to change the wording of the Student Judicial System document, Section II C.1. (page 3 of the document) by adding the words "or his designee" after the word "affairs."

Motion by Mr. Schweizer second Mr. Tingey to call the previous question on the amendment; passed voice vote. Vote on endorsement of the amendment: Passed unanimously by voice vote.

D. Resolution concerning the report of the Faculty Publications Committee. Motion by Mr. Kerner, seconded by Mr. Crawford, to postpone discussion on this item to report by Committee on Committees. Motion passed by voice vote.

V. REPORTS

A. The Senate now turned its attention to a report from the Committee on Academic Status of Undergraduates submitted by Robert W. Mayer, Director

of Admissions and Records and secretary of the committee. Mr. Hunt asked what was the authority under which this document was submitted. Mr. Denn indicated that it came from the charge to the committee and the definition of the word "formulate." Mr. Mayer indicated that the submission of this report is consistent with the previous activities of the committee, that indeed a precedent exists for this kind of document.

A motion by Mr. Halio seconded by Mr. Kerrane that the Committee on Academic Status of Undergraduates reconsider the paragraph on incompletes (this is the first full paragraph on page 3 of the report). Some debate followed. Mr. Schweizer moved the previous question, second Mr. Tingey, passed voice vote. Vote on the Halio motion: Passed by voice vote.

Motion by Miss DeArmond, seconded by Mr. Salsbury to recommit to committee the first paragraph of the report (change of date for withdrawal and change of registration without penalty). Mr. Lippert called for the previous question, second by Mr. Anapol, passed voice vote. The DeArmond motion passed by voice vote.

Motion by Mr. Denn, seconded by Mr. Williams: RESOLVED, That this report will not be University policy until the University Faculty Senate approves it. Motion was withdrawn.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:58 p.m. on motion by Mr. Halio, seconded by Mr. Bonner.

Respectfully submitted,

Henry B. Tingey, Secretary

HBT:psb