

**Faculty Senate 1/14/20**

CSU FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES  
Tuesday, January 14, 2020 **Library 4<sup>th</sup> FL Auditorium**

**ATTENDANCE:**

Walid AL-GHOUL, Alesia RICHARDSON, Judith BIRGEN, Tekleab GALA, Sarah BUCK, Eddy GAYTAN, Valerie GOSS, Tonya HALL, Soo KANG, Ann KUZDALE, Michael McNICHOLS, Rae-Anne MONTAGUE, Gayle PORTER, William Jason RAYNOVICH, Robert RICHTER, Byung-In SEO, Patricia STEINHAUS, Mohammad TAUSEEF, Yashika WATKINS, Chyrese WOLF, Asmamaw YIMER

**GUESTS:**

**Call to order 12:35**

Minutes December 3, 2019 approved. 11 affirmed, 3 opposed

**Working Meeting Topic:**

Changes to the Faculty Senate Constitution and the Faculty Senate Bylaws

**Presider:**

Senator Jason Raynovich

On 10/29/2019, Senators received suggested changes to the Constitution and the Bylaws proposed by the Rules and Operations Committee (ROC). At the Nov 5, 2019 Senate meeting the ROC requested feedback by Jan 14, 2020. On 12/17/2019 Senate President Steinhaus drafted a message reminding faculty to review the documents (which were re-sent), and to provide the ROC with feedback, as well to come prepared to the Jan 14, 2020 to vote up or down the proposed changes, given any additions and deletions previously submitted. P. Steinhaus provided hard copies at the meeting.

Senator Richter suggested that committee members agree to focus the discussion on open-ended questions followed by the suggested changes, and then to vote on the documents.

**Draft Timeline:**

- 01/14 Senate Vote
- 02/01 Unit A Faculty Vote completed
- 03/01 ROC updates Constitution and Bylaws
- 03/15 ROC will notify departments (or disciplines) of expiring senators terms
- 04/07 Nominations open for FS Executive Committee
- 05/01 ROC will receive names of elected FS from departments (or disciplines)
- 05/05 Vote shall occur for FS Exec Committee 2020-2021

Senators asked if quorum existed. More than 50% senators (18 attendees) of question current roster lists 33 senators. [two members arrived later to the meeting]

Open Discussion Topics from the Body

- 1.) [ByLaws– Article V, D, 1-2] Committee Chair Gayle Porter requested changes to section 2D (page 15-16) regarding Graduate Council. Senator Steinhaus will discuss with President regarding enforcement of the items.
- 2.) [Bylaws – Article IV, E, 11] Senator Kang asked a question related to the enforcement of Technology
- 3.) [Bylaws– Article IV, E, 9] Senator Hall asked if the Summer Committee review of Appendix A could be included in the current changes. Senator Raynovich indicated that the ROC proposes changes to that part of the constitution since we are not during summer session, and Senator Steinhaus indicated that the summer work on review and changes to Appendix A had a motion that failed.
- 4.) [Bylaws – Article V, G] Senator Kuzdale suggested adding CTRE Committee. Senator McNichols explained the process and informed that we do not have time to make necessary changes prepared. Many senators agree that CTRE must have a larger profile. Fellow Senator suggested that we add that CTRE representation be added to the Technology Committee, which was not accepted due to many non-related functions between CTRE and the Technology Committee.

Kuzdale motioned to add CTRE Committee. VGoss seconded.

Discussion among senators clarified about the function of the committee, and the senate’s role and relationship to other committees, which is was reinforced about the inherent differences between the two areas. All agreed that reporting from CTRE (who has requested a senate liaison) is crucial to faculty functions.

Steinhaus called the question. Motion passed 14-5, 1 abstain.

Follow-up discussion opposed the motion, and suggested that we schedule another [Constitution and Bylaws] meeting because the suggested change was not submitted before the current meeting, as requested. Senator Richter stated that we should use an Add Hoc Committee to follow-up on this issue. Senator Hall, also supported the delay based on the fact that there is uncertainty about meeting quorum. Senator McNichols clarified the time-line, and the undoing on the current motion delay to offer clarity. The number of 25 votes, as noted by Senator Birgen, refers to members of faculty at large.

Steinhaus suggested that we delay actions on A.Kuzdale’s motion (and any others changes) because the suggestion did not come through the ROC committee via our process. Senate leadership will convene an Ad Hoc Committee to explore suggested

changes. The Ad Hoc committee will work with ROC to bring forward changes to the body in the next academic year. The senate agreed 18 yes, 1 no, 1 abstain.

Kang clarified that the CTRE text should be easy to update, as there is available text on what ought to be included for new committee definition, duties, and reports.

### **Discussion on Constitution and Bylaw changes**

Senator Goss asked if the changes would reduce the number of senators, and Senator Raynovich responded “yes”. Senator Raynovich also responded yes when asked if the number of disciplines represented on the senate would be reduced. Not meeting quorum at regular monthly FS meeting was offered as primary justification for the change in representation by Discipline to representation by Department. Senator Birgen offered that we are unbounded and Roberts Rules of Order is just a guide for us but we are free to change quorum threshold. Senator Kuzdale suggested that the FS could solve the problem of being without a quorum by changing the nature of the quorum rather than to eliminate disciplinary exclusivity in senate representation. Senator Kuzdale noted the seriousness of the membership changes to multi-disciplinary departments. The elimination of Senate membership by discipline in favor of "departmental" representation does not allow adequate representation of University faculty. Programs in multi-disciplinary departments do not have the same understanding of a different discipline’s concerns. A vote in favor of the proposed ROC change represents a dramatic change from the past 10 years. Reducing representatives and eliminating membership from programs or disciplines means that a narrow remnant of the faculty will govern.

Further discussions centered on having a leaner, more effective senate, as opposed to having a large collection of senators on paper who sparingly participate or attend senate meetings.

Comments and feedback on ROC’s suggested changes to Constitution and Bylaws varied and where generally in agreement, except when reduction of representation would occur. Expressed concern for unrepresented voice in FS votes. Senators strongly agree that representation should come from different disciplines when a department has more than one discipline. It was affirmed during the meeting that all University faculty are welcome at senate meetings to ensure engagement and knowledge of faculty actions and concerns. Alternatively, meetings should be well attended.

Steinhaus called the question.

**Name** motioned to accept Action Item 1, ROC changes to the Constitution and Bylaws.

**Name** seconded

Action item 1: 13 yes, 4 no, 3 abstain

Name motioned to accept Action Item 2, ROC changes to the Constitution and Bylaws.

Name seconded

Action item 2: 14 yes, 2 no, 4 abstain

Motion to adjourn 1:59 PM Respectfully submitted, V.Goss, Corresponding Secretary