The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m. Before proceeding with the business of the meeting, President Bird asked for a moment of silence in memory of colleagues who had passed during the last academic year. She also took a few minutes to introduce the elected Senate Executive Committee for the 2003-2004 academic year.

The Minutes from the meetings of April 16 and April 23, 2003 were approved as presented.

SENATE PRESIDENT’S REPORT (Elizabeth Bird)

President Bird began her report by stating that it had been a rather tumultuous couple of years. Everyone had learned a lot, and she believes most are probably ready to move on. She added that there is great deal to do and hoped to make a start on it today. Her report consisted of the following important issues:

- The Permanent Faculty Personnel Rules

  The rules, as passed by the Senate in March, were approved by the Board of Trustees and will be in effect in October, pending final approval at the State level. Although there was some last minute work in response to wording changes ordered in Tallahassee, she believes the substantive content was maintained. Some important things that the University of South Florida (USF) gained in these personnel rules included:

  - It is the first university in Florida to add sexual orientation to the non-discrimination rule.
  - It achieved a definition of academic freedom and responsibility that is far better and more encompassing than before.
  - It formalized the peer review committee to be used in tenured faculty termination decisions.
  - Faculty were put back into the mix wherever important decisions are made that affect them from tenure decisions to layoffs.
  - It secured much better leave provisions than those featured in the Emergency Rules.
  - Better definitions of what constitutes professional, outside activities were written.
  - A better grievance procedure was secured that was not so lop-sided in favor of administration. However, the United Faculty of Florida (UFF) will be formalizing the grievance process that will apply to most of the faculty.

President Bird pointed out that it is now time for the Senate to turn over terms and conditions of employment to the UFF. Collective bargaining between the UFF and the university is beginning, and she did not think that the Senate will be addressing these issues in the near future.
The AAUP formally condemned USF in June for its handling of the Dr. Sami Al-Arian case. At the meeting, the Senate was represented by Senator Steve Permuth. President Bird pointed out that this action fell short of censuring the university. It is important to understand that this was by no means a ringing endorsement of USF. Committee A, which examines cases of academic freedom infringements, had suggested no action be taken at this time, primarily because an institution that is censured must be able to respond by doing something to remedy the situation. Since Dr. Al-Arian is now incarcerated, no remedy is immediately apparent. The AAUP members, however, voted down the motion that no action be taken, arguing that USF’s actions during the early days of the Al-Arian case were too egregious to pass unremarked. The condemnation was the end result, and AAUP has assured USF that it will be keeping a close eye on developments relating to academic freedom and governance at the university.

President Bird pointed out that there are several crucial reasons why it is vital for USF to reform its old ways of doing business when it comes to shared governance. Some of these reasons were:

- USF should try to get back into the good graces of AAUP.
- USF is facing SACS reaccreditation, and one thing it has to prove is that has a working system of faculty governance.
- It is time to develop a real, productive relationship between administration and faculty.
- Finally, it is the right thing to do – really good universities are those with a strong faculty, a committed faculty, and a faculty who believe their voices are heard.

The success of the Rules Committee was taken in some circles to mean that things have changed, and certainly it was a step in the right direction. President Bird thanked Senator Graham Tobin and the other members for working so hard to establish a cordial and productive working relationship among faculty and administrators. Nevertheless, there is still a long way to go, as she learned over the summer. For example, she discovered policies that would have a direct and significant effect on faculty had been developed and, in some cases, moved toward promulgation, with literally no faculty involvement. An initiative on changing the process to grant emeritus status, had been sent to Academic Affairs to be brought to the Senate’s attention, and had never been seen again. Other policies developed with considerable faculty and student input have languished for almost a year, for instance a policy on campus free speech, that was “buried on an administrator’s desk.”

President Bird has had several meetings with Interim Provost Khator and President Genshaft, which have been cordial and productive. At her request, Dr. Khator halted the promulgation of some questionable policies. There are now committees charged to examine them and make recommendations. Senator Steve Permuth is leading a group looking at a proposed regional campus plan and how it affects faculty. The Graduate and Undergraduate Councils are looking at a policy on exploitation in the classroom, which had been moving through without faculty input. Senator Emanuel Donchin, with cooperation from the Honors and Awards Council, has chaired a
committee to rethink the granting of Emeritus status. Dr. Khator has expressed a commitment to work with the faculty, and she is making it clear to other administrators that they must include faculty in all decisions that affect them. President Bird plans to put together a working group on governance to look at infusing these principles throughout the university.

President Bird emphasized that her goal as Senate President is to make the Senate more proactive. The Senate needs to bring attention to issues that directly affect the quality of life for faculty, e.g. working conditions, the out-of-control problems of theft in many buildings, overcrowded classrooms, the fact that while administrators’ salaries keep pace with national standards, faculty salaries continue to lag behind. Her intent is to involve faculty – not just Senators. She wants people to bring issues to the Senate, and step forward when there is work to be done. She would like to see Senators communicate better with their constituents, so everyone is not working in isolation. In addition, President Bird wants to make the Senate web site a real source of information about important faculty issues. Some of the issues, such as suggested changes in the constitution and a document that lays out suggested principles of shared governance, discussed at today’s meeting will help move the Senate forward.

Finally, in her role as a member of the Board of Trustees, President Bird promised to do her best to represent the concerns of the faculty. Indeed, the only reason she is on the Board is for that purpose. In order to do that well, she pointed out that she must be aware of Senators’ concerns and issues, and she encouraged them to contact her.

President Bird believes that USF is at a crossroads for faculty governance. The faculty can either continue to look back on the sorry state of governance as they have had in the past, or seize the opportunity to make themselves heard and really make a difference.

**REPORT FROM INTERIM PROVOST RENU KHATOR**

Interim Provost Khator announced that generally, after the first Faculty Senate meeting of the new academic year there is a reception for the outgoing Senate President. A reception was not planned after today’s meeting because the outgoing President is on leave. So, she took a few minutes to thank all of the Senators for being part of the governance council and taking the time from their busy schedules to say how important the faculty voice and shared governance is. Interim Provost Khator pointed out that it does matter, especially in today’s time, when higher education is getting more politicized, more democratized and more legalized. It is important that the university stay focused on the academic principles and see how the intended mission can be accomplished.

At this time, instead of giving a comprehensive report, Interim Provost Khator asked the Senators what issues were on their minds and she would make up her report on the spot.

**Question:** At some time, could you provide us with an organizational chart of the university, showing the relationship between your office and the Health Sciences Center?
Response: That is a very good question. I will work on that and get back to you.

Question: Regarding the FAST! System, some of us are not able to spend grant money. Is there an attempt being made to do something about this?

Response: Absolutely, we are working with the different groups (Budget Office, Accounts Payable, etc.) trying to find out why some of these issues have been addressed and not others. Each group provided me with a list of problems. Then I met with the senior staff of Vice President Carlucci and I said I want to know what issues you have so we can do something together, and I got a list of their issues. Dr. Carlucci and I went back to the budget office after meeting with middle level managers and had a discussion with the budget officer why those issues have not been addressed and which ones would be addressed immediately. Then he set up a forum. That forum now includes a top group here, and out of six people, four have been appointed from the academic cycle. They are looking at some of these issues to see which can be resolved quickly. The second piece of it seems like there may have been some issues that were not addressed so let me propose if it would be comfortable, I’m more than happy to invite Dr. Carlucci to come with me to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee so we can have an extended discussion on what the issues are. I know there are lots of things that can be fixed but some that cannot be fixed because of the budget issue.

REPORT FROM USF UNITED FACULTY OF FLORIDA GREGORY MCCOLLM

Senator McCollm announced that neither United Faculty of Florida (UFF) President Roy Weatherford nor Vice President Mark Fisher was able to attend today so he was reporting on their behalf. UFF is getting ready for bargaining which is complex and protracted, especially between two new bargaining teams. The first step is pre-bargaining which includes such things as when and where to meet, who has the authority to say what, etc.

Last month, President Weatherford, our Chief Negotiator, Bob Welker, and our Tallahassee Coordinator, met with some of the administration’s team to talk about these mechanics. UFF claims that the Board inherited the unions, contracts, and the family ghosts of the old Board of Regents, but the Board disagrees and that is complicating bargaining. While that plot continues, the bargaining team will be getting “around the elephant in the living room” as best they can. Most agree that some items have been so affected by reorganization of the State University System that they have to be reworked. For example, grievances. Previously, an unhappy faculty member would file a complaint called a grievance asserting that their contract had been violated. Note that the complaint deals with contractual violations, not with injustices. This leads to step one which is an attempt to resolve the issue at the university level. If the issue is not resolved in step one, the grievance would go to step two, with the Board of Trustees or the Board of Education in Tallahassee. If the grievance still was not resolved in step two, then the Union could, if it wanted, move the case on to impartial arbitration which is, calling in an impartial arbitrator from outside to hear the issue and make a ruling that establishes a precedent. However, due to the reorganization, Tallahassee is out of the loop at least for now.

The question is what happens to step two? That is one of the questions that the bargaining teams are going to have to deal with. Still in the midst of this the UFF are having some “elephant
problems.” For example, President Weatherford could not attend today’s meeting because he has a class right now. The problem is that unions, among other things, use all kinds of campus resources which they need in order to function, such as the right to meet on campus, the right to allow members to deduct their dues from their paychecks, and course releases. None of these resources were free. Every single one of them was in their contract and they were in the contract because at some time in the bargaining, UFF’s bargaining team won that condition to get them in the contract, usually in exchange for something else. These are things that the union needs in order to do its job. Every single one of those things mentioned, has been denied by at least one university. USF is denying UFF course releases, which means that the senior officers are not getting any class time off in order to do their jobs. Those faculty who have had administrative duties can imagine how much time and energy is consumed by the minutia and stress of running a union. The USF chapter wants course releases for its President, its Grievance Chair, for its Chief Negotiator and so on but currently all are working without them.

With bargaining time approaching, members of the bargaining unit will be receiving a survey asking them which issues are their priorities. This is for the bargaining team, so in the tradition of poker playing, the bargaining team will not be announcing the results but instead use them as a guide as part of the bargaining materials. The team encourages people to return the surveys, as the more information they get from a wider range of sources, the better feel the team has for what the faculty wants.

REPORT FROM PRESIDENT JUDY GENSHAFT

Before beginning her report, President Genshaft responded to Senator McColm’s statement that she is not on the bargaining team either, and that the bargaining goes from the faculty union to the Board of Trustees. She also clarified that there is a subcommittee that deals with the bargaining as well.

When President Genshaft met with the Senate Executive Committee at a luncheon she said to them that she is committed to work together on a shared governance structure for this university. Everyone acknowledges that this university has never had a shared governance structure in the administrations previously hired. She reiterated that she is committed to working together on a shared governance structure which really is a cultural shift for everyone. For example, when she was asked about items such as search committees for positions, the Senate was consulted, predominantly the President of the Senate, on names of people and those that would be serving. She has been following the Senate Executive Committee’s recommendation on the timing of the Provost Search Committee. It was brought to her attention that there were not enough faculty on it and that there were too many administrators on it. This was rectified by asking for names of faculty and how many should serve on the committee. Three faculty were added on that committee and the number of administrators was reduced.

President Genshaft ended her report by stating that the university should move forward in a way that everyone can work together. Although it will not always be perfect, she is committed to working together on shared governance.

At this time President Genshaft answered the following questions from the Senators:
Question: I had a discussion with a friend who is now at the University of Florida and he said that they are working on this very issue and he has been working with the Senate there. Would there be an advantage to find out what is going on at the University of Florida and maybe start a dialogue to see if we are looking at the same issues and do they have the secret as to how they might be resolved?

Response: I think that’s a great idea. What I’ve read from the literature, shared governance means different things to different universities. We have to design what works best here. I know that President Bird has been working on this. The materials that I get from different organizations, ACE, etc., everybody is trying to define shared governance. Basically it’s up to us, and I always think it’s a good idea to look elsewhere to see what’s working so that we can design what fits this university best.

Senate President Bird added that she would be attending a meeting of the Advisory Council of Faculty Senates later this week and shared governance is on the agenda. She hopes to talk with the other Senate presidents to find out what is going on. The University of Florida is maintaining a website on shared governance which they are updating from which USF can certainly continue to learn from them.

Question: What is the actual legal status of this shared governance document (Constitution of the Faculty of USF) with respect to the university? We are the ones adopting the language, so to what extent can we actually change the responsibilities of the Faculty Senate? How did that become university policy? There is no overriding university constitution or university bylaws that actually define the authority of the Senate. The bylaws of the university would define the authority of the Senate, and the President and the Chancellor did not really have much to say other than to try and affect the bylaws. It is not clear to me what the legal status of the Constitution is. How does this group of people decide what they want to see? How do they perceive themselves?

Response: I am going to ask Senator Graham Tobin and Associate Provost Phil Smith to answer that because these are all the policies and procedures that you have just been working on. What I really appreciate about your statement is that this is not about Judy Genshaft, it is about the way in which the university is directioning.

Response (Senator Tobin): Last year I was Chair of the Ad-Hoc Rules Committee that was put together to work with Faculty Senate members and the administration and others in terms of trying to promulgate some new rules to replace the emergency rules. Going through that procedure meant that we were coming up with these new ideas, new rules but then what happened to them? That was the question for the Senate in the spring when we were trying to sort that out. Phil then took over, he said we move to the next level and the next level, it has to be approved in certain ways. The official guidelines have a timeline.

Response (Associate Provost Smith): As far as the university rules are concerned, which is a process defined under the state’s Administrative Procedures Act, we have to go through this step-by-step process which ultimately culminates in those rules being accepted by the Secretary
of State. Where we are in this process right now is we have cleared the last major hurdle. The last word we had is they are on their way to the Secretary of State and unless something happens that we don’t anticipate will happen, the faculty rules will be in effect about October 6th.

Rules are different than policies. Rules require Board of Trustees approval; policies have to be promulgated according to administrative procedures. What is captured in policy goes through a promulgation process where various groups are notified and they have an opportunity to see the content of those policies. One of the things President Bird was talking about earlier was to have the Senate involved early on in that promulgation process so that the Senate is not in a reactive mode to policies as they emerge in the university.

I think what you were asking is what is it that gives the Senate a specific role in participating as a partner in governance. Senator McColm mentioned that we are going to the bargaining table. In the old contracts, in the preamble to the bargaining agreement, there is a fairly definitive statement where the parties recognize the role of Faculty Senate in the governance of the university and the proper role of the Faculty Union in the governance of the university. The statement that has been made historically in the preamble to the bargaining is that the role of the Faculty Senate is to have a say in those matters that are academic, curriculum, programs, etc., while the Union has primary responsibility in terms and conditions of employment meaning salary, leave programs, those kinds of situations. It goes on to say, however, that the university has a right to consult with the faculty generally so that the Senate is not prohibited from having a consultative role in those matters that pertain to terms and conditions of employment, but that only the Union is authorized legally as the bargaining agent for the faculty in those matters. That’s the distinction that’s drawing a contract with respect to the center. I don’t know if that answers your question.

Response (President Bird): I don’t think that it does. I think the question is, is whatever changes we make to the Constitution is now what we say the Senate does, but who is to tell the Faculty President that they now agree that is what it is saying?

Response (Associate Provost Smith): Let me give you a concrete example. What if somebody moves that the first line of the responsibilities section of the Constitution said that the Senate has primary responsibility for all decisions affecting education policy on this campus. No decision that affects education policy can be taken without Senate approval period. Let’s suppose it passes. Does that violate the academic process, not to do anything that protects the academic policy?

Response (President Bird): We would have to move to the next step and say because of the policy of the university that we follow whatever the Senate says or the principles of shared governance that we are going to be looking at. I would suggest if those do pass that we go beyond saying that the President says she agrees with them, but we say now let’s move them to become university policy which then becomes promulgated and appears officially. So that’s why we need to put things onto the books as such policy. That’s one of the reasons, for example, that in the university rules, the position the Senate adopted last year called, Academic Freedom, is now in the faculty rules.
REPORT FROM STUDENT GOVERNMENT LIAISON KALI CAMPBELL

Student Liaison Campbell gave a review of the activities of the Student Senate Government meeting. However, in the future, if the Faculty Senate has any specific information that it would like or certain issues that it would like for her to take back to Student Government, she would be willing to do that.

The first issue reported was a grievance brought to one of the student Senators by a former cabinet member from the executive branch. He asked that an impeachment committee be formed for Student Body President Omar Khan and Vice President Ryan Morris. The Senate elected two committees, one for Mr. Khan and one for Mr. Morris, which will investigate the charges. If the committees find there are grounds for impeachment, it will be brought to the Senate floor, and if two thirds find that it should go to the Supreme Court it will. Otherwise, it will be dropped.

The second issue reported on was that the Rules Committee sent to the Student Senate floor the Ninth Supreme Court Justice. She will be confirmed next Tuesday which will complete the Supreme Court roster. A new Rules Committee Chair was elected, as well as all members of the Activity and Service Fees Recommendation Committee (ASRC).

COMMITTEE REPORTS AND ACTIONS

a. Senate Vacancies (Jana Futch Martin)

Secretary Martin announced that during the summer a few vacancies had occurred on the Faculty Senate. In the College of Education, newly elected Senator John Angell resigned and will be replaced by Professor Steve Permuth who was the next person in line with the most votes from that college. Senator Sape Zylstra from the School of Architecture retired and he is replaced by Professor Daniel Powers. Senator Harry Vanden is on sabbatical from the College of Arts and Sciences and Professor John Cochran is replacing him for the academic year.

Secretary Martin also announced that this would be the last time that meeting materials would be sent through campus mail. In the future, these same materials will be either posted on the Senate website or sent to you via email or both.

b. Nominations from Committee on Committees (Ellis Blanton)

Committee on Committees (COC) Chair Blanton announced that he had received during the summer a special request from the President’s Office for the COC to review nominees to the Presidential Committees and Councils so that appointments could be made as early as possible in the Fall Semester. At today’s meeting he presented the following nominees for the Presidential Committees and Councils which came as a motion made and seconded by the COC:
COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
PRESIDENTIAL COMMITTEES AND COUNCILS

September 3, 2003

Athletics Council
Ann Cranston-Gingras (EDU)

Committee on Issues of Sexual Orientation
Michael Foley (VPA)

Women’s Status Committee
Marion Becker (FMHI)
Jeanne Travers (VPA)

The motion was passed to accept these nominees and they will be forwarded to the
President for her consideration.

Chair Blanton announced that since the COC was not formed at the last Faculty Senate
in April, a call for volunteers will be made at the end of today’s meeting.

The deadline for submitting nominations for committee/council membership is October
1, 2003. Chair Blanton encouraged the SEC members to go out and talk with their
colleagues and have them consider service on the Senate Standing Committees and
Councils. The COC is hoping to have a rich base from which to make the decisions.

OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business to discuss at today’s meeting.

NEW BUSINESS

President Bird changed the order of the agenda to first discuss the proposed resolution followed
by the revisions to the Constitution.

a. Proposed Resolution and Principles of Shared Governance

President Bird presented the following document to the Faculty Senate as a motion made
and seconded by the Senate Executive Committee and the floor was opened for
discussion.

Proposed Resolution and Principles of Shared Governance

The University of South Florida Faculty Senate acknowledges the decision of the
American Association of University Professors to condemn the university’s actions that
led to the termination of a tenured professor. This condemnation has brought negative attention to USF, and is an embarrassment to members of the faculty.

The Senate resolves that it is now incumbent upon both the USF Administration and the Faculty to work together to develop a climate conducive to the operation of genuinely shared faculty governance, in which faculty have a primary role in determining all policy and practice relevant to the academic functioning of the university.

The Senate thus endorses the Principles of Shared Governance presented below. We call upon the President, Provost, and the entire Administration both to endorse these Principles and to respond appropriately to Senate initiatives that will transform these principles into practice.

**USF Principles of Shared Governance**

All great universities embrace the concept of shared governance, which reflects a commitment by faculty, administration, and staff to work together toward the common goal of strengthening the educational mission of the university. Indeed, USF has recognized the concept in Rule, by stating that “On the part of the Administration, Academic Responsibility implies a commitment actively to foster within the University a climate favorable to responsible exercise of freedom, by adherence to principles of shared governance, which require that in the development of academic policies and processes, the professional judgments of faculty members are of primary importance.”

Shared governance represents a mutual respect within the university community for the contributions that all members bring to that common goal. As expressed by the AAUP, "a college or university in which all the components are aware of their interdependence, of the usefulness of communication among themselves, and of the force of joint action will enjoy increased capacity to solve educational problems."

USF seeks to underline its role as a major public university by making an unequivocal commitment to these central principles of shared governance:

1. Faculty members have the **principal** responsibility for originating policy, under administrative supervision, in the following areas:
   - Academic policy, including initial authorization and direction of all courses, curricula, and degrees offered;
   - Scholastic policy, including scholastic standards for admission, grading, continuation, graduation, and honors; and
   - Academic ethics, including development of policies and procedures
   - Research

2. The faculty shall act **jointly** with the administration to make recommendations in the areas of:
• Polices and procedures for faculty appointment, promotion and tenure review, reward systems; discipline and termination;
• Student conduct and activities;
• Budgetary review and strategic planning;
• Selection and review of academic administrators;
• Making of policy concerning the general academic welfare of the University.

3. A commitment to shared governance requires that faculty members, primarily through their representative governance body, the Faculty Senate, as well as through College and Department governance structures, must be included at all stages of the process of making/reviewing policy, developing curricula, selecting and reviewing administrators, making budgetary decisions, and all other areas relevant to the academic functioning of the University. Notification after the fact does not constitute such inclusion. Shared governance must be seen to operate at all levels of the University, from departments, through Colleges, to the University as a whole. Governance documents at all these levels should reflect this spirit, and governance should be seen to operate accordingly.

Senator Hector Vila asked for a point of clarification. As Chair of the Governmental Relations Committee, he convened that committee which worked on a document that was very similar to the one presented at today’s meeting. The wording was very similar, not as much detail, more conceptual rather than detail. However, the document was not forwarded to the Faculty Senate for consideration. It was not clear to Senator Vila whether his committee’s document would still be considered Old Business as it was last year or whether it would be considered New Business for this year. Therefore, he asked for a point of clarification because the document addresses the very same issues.

President Bird replied that since the committee’s document has not come to the Senate, it is not old business. However, if the Governmental Relations committee believes that its resolution needs to be considered and added to the current one, it should be presented at the next Senate Executive Committee. If presenting the results of the Governmental Relations Committee meeting to the Executive Committee changes this document, then a decision needs to be made today whether or not to act upon this document. Senator Vila replied that his observation would be that this old business could help facilitate portions of the current document.

At this time a motion was made to postpone consideration of the current document on Shared Governance until Senator Vila’s document could be brought to Executive Committee for discussion and perhaps vote on both documents. The motion was seconded. A point of order was called. The motion to table discussion of the current shared governance document failed, so discussion continued.

A motion was made to amend the first line of the third paragraph of the USF Principles of Shared Governance section to read “USF seeks to underline its role as a community of
scholars by making an unequivocal commitment to these central principles of shared governance.” The motion to amend was seconded and passed.

A motion was made and seconded to change item number 1 of the Shared Governance document to read “Faculty members have the principal responsibility for originating policy in the following areas (deleting the words “under administrative supervision”). The motion was passed.

A motion was made to reword paragraph two of the proposed resolution to read “The Senate resolves that the USF administration and the faculty work together to develop genuinely shared governance in which faculty have a primary role in determining all academic policy and practices.” The motion was seconded and passed.

A motion was made to strike the last sentence of the first paragraph. A friendly amendment was made to delete the entire first paragraph and start the document with the second paragraph. The motion passed.

A motion was made and seconded to send this document back to the Senate Executive Committee for further discussion and refinement. The motion failed. Additional comments were made regarding the document with a call to question. The motion to call to question was seconded and passed. At this time, a vote was passed to adopt the resolution as amended.

b. **Revisions to the Constitution**

President Bird explained that many of the proposed changes or amendments are a result of work that was done by Past President Gregory Paveza. He worked on these over the summer, they were brought to the Senate Executive Committee, changed, modified, but the impetus of this came from the notion that there are things that have been going on in the Senate for some time that were not in the Constitution. The Constitution had not caught up with reality and some points need to be clarified. These proposed changes or amendments came to the Faculty Senate as a motion from the Senate Executive Committee. It was decided that each proposed change or amendment would be presented with discussion at the end.

The first proposed change dealt with Faculty Senate membership on page one. It does not state that the membership has ex-officio members, it lists them later and ex-officio members are stated in this section as a clarification. The ex-officio members are now spelled out in the third paragraph. Some additions have been made, essentially some of these people have been functioning over the years but it has not been formalized. For example, the issue of the ROTC Commanding Officers. In the past few years, it has been customary for the three Commanding Officers of the ROTC to attend Senate meetings as voting members. However, this is not stated in the Constitution. The Senate Executive Committee discussed this and voted unanimously that three Commanding Officers should not be members of the Senate ex-officio. One member representing all three would be more appropriate.
The next major change was on page two, paragraph four. A person may seek re-election for a second three year term. Previously the Constitution has said that a Senator can serve one term, but must take a year off. Then he/she can serve another term. The proposed change is for two consecutive terms before a Senator must take one off.

On page three under Officers. The Faculty Senate shall have a President, Vice President, Secretary, Sergeant-at-Arms, and Senator-at-Large. The change is the addition of the Senator-at-Large into the official documentation. The next largest change was in the responsibilities of the Senate. Again, the motivation is to strengthen the responsibilities of the Senate. The old paragraph has been deleted with the second paragraph being new. That language is very standard in responsibilities of the university.

On page four, Article V, Meetings, he or she was added there. Article VI, Amendments to the Constitution, the proposed new language “or by a motion brought forward from the Senate Executive Committee” was added.

Finally to bring the document into compliance, Board of Regents was changed to the Board of Governors and their Board of Trustees.

At this time, the proposed changes and amendments were discussed.

A motion was made by Naval ROTC Commanding Officer Richard Dick to amend the proposed change regarding ROTC membership on the Senate to read “and the Commanding Officers of the Army, Naval and Air Force ROTC units.” The motion was seconded and opened for discussion.

Commander Dick explained that rather than the three units selecting one person, all would attend Faculty Senate meetings as ex-officio members individually because each of the units is different. Each unit has a contract with the university itself. He explained that each unit has faculty on Admissions, on Athletics, on Undergraduate Council, all faculty committees. The Faculty Senate lets each unit fulfill its obligations to represent each organization per the agreement to sit in on committee meetings, and not go around and have a representative on every one of these committees. It makes sense for each unit to be a member of the Faculty Senate since the units are precluded from sitting on a variety of committees.

President Bird responded to the issue of the contract because she had a discussion with the General Counsel on the interpretation of the contract. The General Counsel read it that the Faculty Senate is not a committee, and that one representative would be perfectly in accordance with the spirit of that contract.

Due to a time limitation, a call to question was made to end discussion. The motion was seconded and passed. A vote was taken on the amendment to read that there should be one representative for each ROTC unit. The motion failed. Discussion returned to the issue of the Constitution as a whole.
A motion was made and seconded to approve the changes and amendments as presented and to end discussion. The motion failed and discussion continued.

The suggestion was made that notes on what is discussed and the various opinions could be put on the website so Senators could come to the next meeting prepared. It would be helpful administratively as to how the Senate operates that when there are important documents like this that are sent prior to the meeting, that there be some kind of feedback channel to get information back to the President and Executive Committee.

Concern was expressed that every Standing Committee and Council chair becomes a voting member of the Faculty Senate. It was pointed out that those chairs are not elected by colleges, but by a small number of people. It contributes to a hierarchical participation.

A motion was made and seconded to table the discussion of the proposed changes and amendments to the Constitution to the next Faculty Senate meeting. President Bird added that there will be more consideration of the document at the Executive Committee level and she encouraged comments and suggestions for discussion. The motion passed.

**ISSUES FROM THE FLOOR**

Graduate Council Chair Sara Mandell commented that she is concerned about Cooper Hall. Her list of concerns included filthy bathrooms, some rooms receive air conditioning, some receive none, and the elevators are poorly operating. She added that she is concerned that nothing is being done to improve the living conditions of faculty and students in Cooper Hall. President Bird responded that although these were valid points nothing could be done at the moment. Issues of faculty life and the ability of the faculty to perform should be Senate issues. Discussion will be held on how to bring these issues forward.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m.