Meeting called to order at 3:10 on February 23, 2015

I. Roll – The following senators were absent: Dowd-Solorzano, Franczak, Minocha, Rodriguez, and White. Aytur, Berglund, Carroll, Denis, Wright, and Wu were excused. David Bachrach, Bill deVries, Lisa MacFarlane, and Anna Sandstrom were guests.

II. Remarks by and questions to the provost – The provost opened her remarks by inviting the faculty senate to make a recommendation regarding a “snow-day policy” to guide faculty, staff, students, and parents regarding the appropriate protocol when operations are curtailed due to inclement weather. It seems that university operations are being curtailed more frequently, and the provost’s hope is that a policy can be in place by next winter. The senate chair mentioned that in a conversation he had with the associate deans, the suggestion was made to leave the matter to the discretion of faculty members this semester, with the possibility of building something into the reading day schedule beginning next academic year. This option is not available to the community this academic year due to the already abbreviated schedule.

The provost emphasized the value of face-to-face time in our classrooms, but said that even a few days missed can cause serious problems for some courses, particularly labs and performing arts courses, which are hard to make up. A senator said that she informed her classes that in the case of snow days, they would have work online to complete and that she received no negative feedback when her plan was utilized. The senator from Nursing asked how clinical hours could be made up. Another comment was made about the robust discussions that can be carried on online, as a back-up option. Another senator pointed out that some students view “curtailed operations” as permission to not do work and conjectured if some different wording might be used to emphasize that they are still responsible for their coursework even during curtailed operations. A senator expressed gratitude for the wisdom of curtailing operations and thereby facilitating the safety of faculty, staff and students.

The provost agreed that the idea is for each faculty member to have a plan to accomplish what is needed should operations be curtailed. She noted the complication of having three campuses to coordinate and said that facilities employees have been working extra shifts and extraordinarily long hours to make the campuses safe for operations.

A senator congratulated the provost on her new appointment as principal of the Philips Exeter Academy, expressing regret at her leaving the university. The provost expressed thanks and her affection for her experiences here at UNH these many years.

III. Remarks by and questions to the chair – The senate chair reminded the senate of the make-up senate meeting to be held next Monday, March 2 in McConnell 240 at the usual time. He then shared a request from the senior vice provost for academic affairs Vasudevan that he inform senate
members about the new International Travel Registry for the university, which will launch later this year. The chair reported that deficiencies were found to exist in the emergency response system for students, faculty, and staff traveling abroad on university business. The chair directed the senators’ attention to the website - [http://www.unh.edu/cie/international-travel-registry](http://www.unh.edu/cie/international-travel-registry) and noted that the registry helps travelers and emergency personnel to access information in the case of an emergency. The registry is administered by the Center for International Education (CIE), and enrollment includes the Travel Assistance and Insurance Program. This program is mandatory for all students, faculty and staff traveling on UNH business, and is FERPA compliant, meeting the university’s privacy requirements. The website itself has answers for most questions about the program. The senate admin will email information about the program and website to all senators for their information and review.

IV. Minutes – It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes of the last senate meeting, January 26, 2015. With a single correction, the minutes were approved unanimously, with two abstentions.

**Discussion/Report Items:**

V. Report from senate vice-chair on motions from AY ’14 – Deb Kinghorn presented to the senate a list of the motions that were passed in last year’s senate session and reported on their current status:

**UNH FACULTY SENATE  2013-14 Motions and their current status**

**MOTION # XVIII-M12** on the review by UCAPC of the proposed dual major in sustainability - UCAPC has completed its report; it is now coming to the Senate for review.

**MOTION # XVIII-M11** on formation of the Carsey School of Public Policy, per UCAPC report - Complete.

**MOTION # XVIII-M10** on Student Senate Resolution XXXV-08 regarding affordability of course materials - Senate reminded again at Nov. 3 meeting.

**MOTION # XVIII-M9** on review of the Confucius Institute - In progress.

**MOTION # XVIII-M8** On exemptions of non-tenured instructors teaching all non eUNH courses from piloting the web-based evaluation for all courses - To date, this has been followed.

**MOTION # XVIII-M7** on inclusion of department chairs on campus construction project steering committees - Needs follow up

**MOTION # XVIII-M6** To extend the on-line course registration period one week into the term - Approved; Registrar has asked for a one year delay in implementation.

**MOTION # XVIII-M5** Procedural rule on substantive main motions - Has been followed by the Faculty Senate
MOTION # XVIII-M4 Amendments to senate constitution (Unit name changes, addition of Law school, etc.) - Completed

MOTION # XVIII-M3 approval of five-year calendar - There was one major oversight in the calendar approval. Apparently graduation may never be held on Memorial Day weekend, due to the large volume of traffic that both events create; therefore, Spring 2015 semester needed to be set back one week, although spring break did not need to change. The rest of the calendar appears fine. Completed.

MOTION # XVIII-M2 schedule for future on-line Master’s programs - Per the Graduate School, there are no new on-line Master’s programs being proposed.

MOTION # XVIII-M1 on showing mean score 1-13 on evaluation form - Completed

The senate vice-chair noted that all motions except for M7 and M9 have been completed or are being implemented as much as possible. A senator noted that M7 indicates that the department chair or “an assigned designee” may serve on such steering and planning committees. Deb pointed out that there are currently no steering committees functioning on campus, and that all planning committees have such faculty representation. M9 regarding the Confucius Institute is contingent on the findings of the COLA committee currently reviewing the CI.

VI. Report and resolution from agenda committee re: university facilities – The senate vice-chair proposed formal thanks be offered to the university facilities staff for their diligent work during the severe weather this winter. After some discussion among the senate members regarding the intent of this resolution to be as inclusive as possible of all staff who have been working under extraordinary conditions this winter, the resolution was amended and corrected slightly to finally read:

February 22, 2015
From the Agenda Committee

WHEREAS, during winter months, the Grounds and Events department ensures mobility of the campus by providing snow removal and de-icing of 16 miles of sidewalk, 9 miles of road and 48 acres of parking space; and

WHEREAS, the only employees who do work during curtailed operations are those deemed “essential personnel”; and

WHEREAS, the winter of 2015 has had more curtailment and snow emergencies than any winter in recent memory;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate extends heartfelt gratitude to the Grounds and Events Department and to all essential personnel who continue to try to maintain a safe and functioning campus for faculty, staff, students, and administration. We salute you for your selfless dedication to your role in keeping our infrastructure working.

Thus amended, the resolution was put to a vote and passed unanimously. The senate vice-chair will send the resolution to the Grounds and Events Department.
VII. Report and motion from the Academic Affairs Committee on the proposal to cancel classes on the Wednesday before Thanksgiving – The chair of the AAC introduced the administration’s proposal to not hold classes on the Wednesday before Thanksgiving, beginning in the fall 2015, in an effort to reduce dangerous travel issues for students on the busiest travel day of the year. The committee reports and moves the following:

**AAC motion on canceling classes the Wednesday before Thanksgiving**

**Rationale:** The administration has recommended that all classes held on the Wednesday before Thanksgiving be cancelled, beginning in the fall of 2015. This would not, strictly speaking, be a holiday for faculty and staff, but students would be free to leave campus at some time on Tuesday, or earlier, without cutting Wednesday classes. To make up for the lost classes, the October one-day break (“Fall Break Day”) on the calendar would be cancelled.

The Faculty Senate determines the academic calendar, so the proposal has come to the Academic Affairs Committee.

The reasons for this proposal are not far to seek. The Wednesday before Thanksgiving (hereinafter WBT) is the busiest traveling day of the year, and many students, unless they live prohibitively far away, or quite nearby, join the rush sometime on Wednesday or else, to avoid the rush, leave campus on Tuesday whether they have a class on Wednesday or not. UNH Manchester already schedules no classes on WBT, and many instructors on the Durham campus cancel classes on that day, particularly in the afternoon. To give students an extra day to travel will help them plan a more reasonable schedule, will provide a little more flexibility in case of a storm, and should enhance safety.

Against this proposal some professors have argued that the Tuesday before Thanksgiving would become the new WBT, and students would start cutting classes on that day (some already do), and then, in the minds of some students, there would just be Monday to think about, so why not skip the whole week and leave on Friday or Saturday?

Our Committee thinks there is some merit to this slippery-slope argument, but that it is outweighed by the advantages of canceling WBT classes. Senior Vice Provost Vasudevan reported to us that he and others have held the line with some success in their classes by scheduling quizzes on the Monday or Tuesday of Thanksgiving week, offering extra credit for attendance, and the like, and believes such threats and inducements would remain effective after WBT classes are cancelled. (They do not work on WBT itself.) With some skepticism, we agree that this sort of thing might work, and that at the very least students would have no right to complain if a test were given or an assignment were due early in that week. In any case, it is a plan worth trying for a year.

4. **Motion:** The senate Academic Affairs Committee moves that the academic schedule be altered so that:

   (1) classes will no longer be cancelled on the Fall Break Day, and
   (2) classes will be cancelled on the Wednesday before the Thanksgiving Break.
We also move that (3) the Academic Affairs Committee monitor the effect of the alteration next fall and report to the Senate with a recommendation whether or not to continue it.

The committee proposed that this be a one year trial. A suggestion was made to amend the wording of the motion to mandate only one year of implementation, but it was determined that the current wording allows for review by the AAC with data provided by the administration, and the suggestion was withdrawn. Most senators voiced support for the idea, and it was noted that should problems arise from the implementation of this plan, a change can be made in the future. The AAC chair moved to suspend the senate rules so that the motion could be voted on today, as this issue is time-sensitive.

The motion to suspend the rules passed unanimously and the subsequent vote on the motion above passed with 32 votes in favor, none opposed and 1 abstention.

VIII. Report from IT Committee on revised password policy – Maria Basterra, the chair of the ITC presented her committee’s report and recommendation about the USNH password policy proposal. She noted that the committee has reviewed several iterations of this policy and that the most recent proposal addresses some of the committee’s earlier concerns about the required length of the password as well as the enforcement of such requirements. She reported that:

In the present proposal the length requirement for a password is a minimum of 8 characters and the line of enforcement reads:

“Any user found to have violated this policy will be referred to the appropriate officials and may be subject to disciplinary action. The user may seek redress using the appropriate process.”

The committee finds some of the general password requirements unenforceable, e.g.:

• Passwords for USNH services must not be used for services outside of USNH including but not limited to personal banking, Amazon, etc.

• Passwords shall not be written down or stored on-line in clear text.

But, the committee understands these to be standard language and practices in password policies. It is the IT Committee recommendation that the Senate endorses the proposed password policy below.

A senator commented that he had done some research on the frequent changing of passwords, and that he found only two sources of any such research, both of which describe the practice as a waste of time. The senator expressed his belief that such practices encourage phishing schemes by way of phony requests to update such passwords. The senator from Electrical and Computer Engineering agrees that such updates are a waste of time and asked what problem this policy is intended to solve. Maria replied that her committee asked that question and that they were told the intent is to enhance security to better protect the computing infrastructure of the university.
A senator suggested that the current practice of locking faculty out of their accounts if they don’t update their passwords on schedule is already a form of discipline. Another senator mentioned the practice of synchronizing passwords within departments, between the chair and an administrative assistant, for example, and asked if this would be a violation of the policy. It was noted that changing the password, when multiple devices are involved, can become a lengthy and burdensome process, often requiring IT assistance, which raised the question of the resources required to help faculty update their passwords as compared to the resources required to repairing security breaches. Maria pointed out that many of these issues are already part of the existing policy and that this proposal was solely focused on changing the length of the password itself and the rules of enforcement (Item 8 in the Password Policy only). Her committee recommends endorsing the policy.

A senator asked how this policy might be reversed to something less demanding and stringent. Maria responded that her committee expressed many similar concerns in their conversations with IT Security, and that the Information Technology specialists with whom her committee conversed said that it is neglectful to not include this kind of language in the university’s policy. The matter will lay over until the next meeting. The senate chair thanked Maria for her committee’s work.

IX. Report from UCAPC chair regarding the Dual Major in Sustainability (DMS) – David Bachrach, the chair of the University Curriculum and Academic Policies Committee, offered the senators a brief history of the two charges to his committee. 1. UCAPC was charged to reach out to the colleges to get the faculty reaction to the proposal for the DMS, and 2. UCAPC was charged to review the DMS proposal and offer their perspectives on it.

David reported that the committee was unable to fulfill the first charge because they learned that most faculty in all colleges had not ever seen or discussed the DMS proposal, with the exception of the College of Engineering and Physical Sciences. In CEPS, the faculty rejected the proposal.

Regarding the second charge, the UCAPC developed a document which included concerns and questions of the committee regarding the proposal, and sent that document to the drafters of the DMS proposal. Over the course of last semester, the UCAPC and the DMS proposers communicated in an exchange of ideas that resulted in the final proposal, which was included as an attachment to today’s agenda. The UCAPC had two remaining concerns regarding this final draft, one having to do with the funding of the DMS, should enrollments not meet expectations, and the other regarding the second layer of oversight for course approval. These issues were addressed by two letters from the provost’s office which, if binding on the proposal, were sufficient to satisfy the concerns of the UCAPC, who then voted 6-3 in favor of the proposal. [it is noted that the UCAPC minutes from January 30, 2015 record the final vote as 6-2 in favor of the proposal – March 2, 2015 senate meeting clarification]

There followed a senate discussion about the nature of a dual major as opposed to a double major. This dual major allows a student in any major to add 8 additional courses in Sustainability, resulting in a dual major, not a double major, in their original major and Sustainability. It was noted that the DMS includes a capstone experience, and also that as the DMS moves forward, the coursework will become better defined over time. Accreditation for the DMS will be the same as for the rest of the university.
A senator expressed concern that this dual major has the potential to steal the thunder from courses across campus that carry a sustainability theme or emphasis; if not part of the actual dual major, will such classes lose value in the sight of students? David pointed out that any faculty member can petition to have his/her course included as an elective. The dual major includes four required courses and four electives. There will be a Sustainability Committee who will evaluate potential courses, much like the Discovery Committee reviews potential Discovery courses.

A senator asked if this is a hallmark program for UNH. David responded that while this program is not unique to UNH, it is modeled after successful programs in areas like Arizona and Vermont, and that there are not many such programs in the country. There was some discussion about whether the program, which invites students from every major, can ensure that such students have the necessary science background to be successful. A senator expressed concern that students need sufficient experience in genuine science courses in order to be able to identify pseudo-science promoted so prevalent in popular media. As an academic institution, he suggested, our responsibility is to base our teaching on research-supported science.

The student senate representative asked David if there were any overlap of this program with the ecogastronomy program. David said there was not. The senator from Music asserted that since all majors are eligible for this dual major, overlap potentially exists with every program. He asked what is driving this proposal. David responded that such a dual major can be beneficial for science majors in the job market. The senator from Theatre and Dance suggested that arts have no reason to exist if culture is not sustained. She feels that this is an interesting initiative in which UNH can stand as a leader.

The senate chair thanked David and the UCAPC for their extensive work. This matter will lay over until the next meeting. The senior vice provost for academic affairs will be invited to that meeting to answer questions, as will the chair of the DMS committee.

X. Discussion and vote on NTTF Committee motion regarding CLER faculty service in the senate – The committee’s motions to amend the senate constitution and bylaws were brought again before the senate for discussion and a vote today [Faculty Senate meeting minutes 9-22-2014, Item V].

Motion on amendments to faculty senate constitution to include representation of non-tenure track faculty on senate

1. Motion presenter: Willem deVries, chair of the ad hoc Committee on the Representation of NTT Faculty in the Senate


3. Rationale:
The shape of the University's faculty has been changing. Increasingly, non-tenure-track (NTT) faculty of various classifications (lecturers, clinical faculty, research faculty, and extension faculty) join the tenure track faculty to accomplish our academic mission. Since 1996, the voice of the faculty in academic policy making at UNH has been that of the tenure track faculty of the University. In light of the changing composition of the UNH faculty, it is time to reflect our current reality in the constitution of the academic
The national AAUP has released a report calling for greater participation of all faculty in the shared governance structures in higher education, and research has shown that in relation to its comparator institutions, UNH structures its faculty governance body very narrowly. There is a wealth of knowledge and experience spread throughout the faculty of the University. Strong ties and a deep commitment to the University are spread equally across tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty. This knowledge and experience can and should inform University Academic Policy. Furthermore, the educated women and men who execute the University’s Academic Policies should also have a voice in setting, and therefore owning, those policies.

The Committee on Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Membership proposes the following changes to the Faculty Senate Constitution. The goal is to make the Faculty Senate more representative of the faculty—all those engaged directly in the teaching and research mission of the University. This constituency, however, is deeply diverse, ranging from those with life-time appointments to one-semester, single-course appointments. Setting academic policy requires a long view of and significant commitment to the institution. With this in mind, the Committee recommends that all members of the faculty with appointments of at least a one-year duration, 50% time be eligible to vote for representatives in the Faculty Senate. Eligibility to serve in the Senate requires a still longer and stronger tie to the University: 75% time with at least two years experience on the UNH faculty.

4. Motion: The committee recommends the following revisions to the Faculty Senate Constitution:

**Recommended revisions to the Faculty Senate Constitution**

Revise the current "membership" clause to read:
Membership: The Faculty of the University consists of all those directly engaged in the academic mission of the University via teaching and research. Every current member of the faculty who holds at least a one-year, 50% appointment may vote in the election of Faculty Senators. To serve in the Senate, a faculty member must hold a 75% or greater appointment and have been a member of the UNH faculty for 2 years.

Each academic department shall constitute an electoral unit, as shall, for purposes of Faculty Senate membership, the Library, the Thompson School, and UNH-Manchester. (See Bylaw 4). Each electoral unit shall elect one representative per 20 voting faculty as defined above. Elections shall be by an approval ballot in which every member of the unit eligible to serve in the Senate is nominated and in which faculty members can vote for as many candidates as they wish. Only faculty eligible to vote as stipulated above may vote. The Faculty Senate shall supervise the

---

1"The Inclusion in Governance of Faculty Members Holding Contingent Appointments” is available at [http://www(aaup.org/report/governance-inclusion](http://www.aaup.org/report/governance-inclusion).
elections.

Revision to subclause 3 "Faculty referendum on senate actions"
Remove the words "tenure-track" in sentence 2, and insert “eligible to vote in Senate elections” after “faculty” in that sentence. Insert “eligible” before “faculty” in sentences 5 and 7.

Revision to 6c. Professional Standards Committee
Remove the word "tenured" from the fourth sentence of clause 6c (Professional Standards Committee) and add "eligible to serve in the Senate" after "faculty members" in that sentence.

Revision to subclause 10 "Meetings open to faculty"
Remove the words "tenure-track".

and:

Motion on amendments to faculty senate bylaws to include representation of non-tenure track faculty on senate

1. Motion presenter: Willem deVries, chair of the ad hoc Committee on the Representation of NTT Faculty in the Senate


3. Rationale:
The shape of the University's faculty has been changing. Increasingly, non-tenure-track (NTT) faculty of various classifications (lecturers, clinical faculty, research faculty, and extension faculty) join the tenure track faculty to accomplish our academic mission. Since 1996, the voice of the faculty in academic policy making at UNH has been that of the tenure track faculty of the University. In light of the changing composition of the UNH faculty, it is time to reflect our current reality in the constitution of the academic policy-making body of the University.

The national AAUP has released a report calling for greater participation of all faculty in the shared governance structures in higher education, and research has shown that in relation to its comparator institutions, UNH structures its faculty governance body very narrowly. There is a wealth of knowledge and experience spread throughout the faculty of the University. Strong ties and a deep commitment to the University are spread equally across tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty. This knowledge and experience can and should inform University Academic Policy. Furthermore, the educated women and men who execute the University's Academic Policies should also have a voice in setting, and therefore owning, those policies.

2“The Inclusion in Governance of Faculty Members Holding Contingent Appointments” is available at http://www.aaup.org/report/governance-inclusion.
The Committee on Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Membership proposes the following changes to the Faculty Senate Constitution. The goal is to make the Faculty Senate more representative of the faculty—all those engaged directly in the teaching and research mission of the University. This constituency, however, is deeply diverse, ranging from those with life-time appointments to one-semester, single-course appointments. Setting academic policy requires a long view of and significant commitment to the institution. With this in mind, the Committee recommends that all members of the faculty with appointments of at least a one-year duration, 50% time be eligible to vote for representatives in the Faculty Senate.. Eligibility to serve in the Senate requires a still longer and stronger tie to the University: 75% time with at least two years experience on the UNH faculty.

4. Motion: The committee recommends the following revisions to the Faculty Senate Constitution:

Revisions to Bylaws

Clause 1:
A. Revise the second sentence to read “The senate assistant will prepare ballots for those units electing senators in a given year, with every faculty member of those units eligible to serve in the Senate appearing on the ballot.”
B. Substitute “Electoral unit” for ‘Department”
C. Substitute “unit” for ‘Department”

Clause 2C: Remove “tenured”; insert “eligible to serve in the Senate” after “unit”

Clause 3: Revise to read:
C. A quorum must be present for the legal transaction of business, and a quorum will consist of a majority of the voting members. Voting members are defined as all faculty senators who have been elected by eligible units. Electoral units that choose not to elect a senator are therefore not counted. A senator may designate another member of her/his unit to act as proxy. If two small units agree to share a senator, they may be represented by one senator with one vote. A proxy for the senator for the combined units may be chosen from those combined units. No senator or proxy may have more than one vote.

1. Electoral units that do not elect and seat a senator will be contacted by the chair of the senate to state that the unit will not be able to bring motions forward on their own nor will the unit have a vote on senate business until the unit seats a senator.
2. If a senator misses three Senate and/or committee meetings in a semester without securing a proxy as per 3.C, the senator shall be contacted by the Senate Chair to discuss the situation. Failing improved participation, the Agenda Committee, upon recommendation of the Chair, may declare the seat vacant and contact the unit for a replacement. It is the right of the unit to respond to the vacancy.
Clause 4: Revise to read:

4. Definition of Faculty Senate members: For purposes of Faculty Senate membership, the following electoral units, and their successors, are eligible to elect senate members. The Agenda Committee is responsible for monitoring this list annually.

The senate chair opened the floor for discussion. A senator asked about the CLER faculty who are not attached to any department, being that the proposed amendments recommend representation by academic department. Bill deVries, the chair of the NTTF committee, responded that there are only about twelve such faculty and that, should the motions pass, there would be opportunity to formulate a plan to include them. Once again, concerns were raised about small departments not being able to provide opportunities for CLER faculty to serve, and about contractual issues with the expectation of senate service. Bill responded that while there is potential for a problem in this area, his committee anticipates that such faculty could justifiably decline service if their contracts prohibit it.

It was noted that the original motions, first brought forward in September 2014, and projected in their original state before the senate today, do not reflect the wording changes made to the constitution and bylaws to include the School of Law and the department of Classics, Humanities, and Italian Studies, but that those changes have in fact been made to the senate constitution and bylaws.

A senator from the Education Department commended the NTTF committee for their tremendous work and service to the senate and faculty, and said that he supports the inclusion of CLER faculty on the senate, but continued that he will be voting against these motions because he believes that departmental representation is not practical. He cited the practice of some departments to not include CLER faculty in departmental faculty meetings, or to not allow them to vote in such meetings, and pointed out the difficulty of such CLER faculty being elected to represent their departmental colleagues. He asserted that if CLER faculty had equal voting privileges in all departments, such departmental representation would make sense, but he questioned whether the senate had the power to instruct departments on such a matter. He suggested that representation by constituency for CLER faculty would receive his full support.

Another senator voiced approval for the representation of CLER faculty in their units, expressing support of having all of these voices in the senate. He then placed this issue in its historical context at the university, saying that the tenure system is under duress at this point with an alarming drop in tenure-track positions at UNH. He asserted that these motions suggest the replaceability of tenure-track faculty on the senate. He also noted that a scenario in which there might be no tenure-track faculty at all on the senate also allows for the possibility that there might be no CLER faculty at all on the senate. Referencing the great demands of senate service and concerns of the burden on faculty who are not contractually obligated to offer such service, he suggested that there are alternative ways for CLER faculty to vote for representation and be present in the senate.

Bill responded that the problem with representation by constituency is that there is no well-established forum for communication between each of the CLER faculty appointment groups across all colleges. He reiterated that the primary academic identity of the CLER faculty members
is through the departments in which they work, and asserted that if tenure-track faculty could appropriately represent their CLER colleagues on the senate, then the CLER faculty should be able to represent their tenure-track colleagues in the same manner. He said that the notion of enfranchisement should be adequate – that they should be allowed to vote for the departmental colleague who will represent them on the senate, and acknowledged that there are contractual roadblocks to work out. Being that the senate conducts its own elections, there should be no jurisdictional issues with departments in that area.

Anna Sandstrom, a visitor from the Lecturers’ Council, assured the senate that the lecturers would prefer departmental representation, concurring with Bill’s statement above. She pointed out that the Lecturers’ Council has only existed for three years, and that the newly formed Clinical Faculty Council is only six months old, indicating no established connections between CLER faculty from different colleges.

The first motion, on amendments to the senate constitution, was put to a vote. There were 21 in favor, 12 opposed, and 4 abstentions. Needing, and failing to achieve, a two-thirds majority, the first motion failed, making the second motion moot.

Jim Connell, representing the agenda committee, then proposed the following:

> Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate recognize the importance of involving all faculty members, tenure track, clinical faculty, lecturers, extension faculty, and research faculty in the Faculty Senate and supports them as voting senators. Therefore, an ad hoc Committee on Clinical, Lecturers, Extension and Research (CLER) Faculty involvement in the Faculty Senate is hereby created with members appointed by the Agenda Committee.

He stated that the vote today clearly shows that CLER faculty representation is desired here, but that further exploration is needed to find the appropriate mechanism for that representation. Bill deVries added that there has been significant attrition of the original committee membership, and that forming a new committee is appropriate.

The rules were suspended in order to vote on this resolution today. The resolution passed unanimously through vote by voice. The entire senate offered their thanks to Bill and his committee for their extensive work on this issue.

XI. New business – there was no new business.

XII. Adjournment- The meeting was adjourned at 4:58 p.m.