Meeting of the Faculty Senate October 15, 2009.

The Faculty Senate met from 5:00-7:00pm in the Heller Building, Room G53.

Present: Bishop, Dibble, Garnick, Gittell, Herzfled, Hickey, Hill, Mann, Mapps, Meyer, Moody, Morrison, Nelson, Troen, von Mering

Absent: Burt, Flesch, Parmentier

Guests: Steven Burg, John Plotz, Leslie Griffith

Report from Faculty Representatives to the Board of Trustees
In the first half of the Senate meeting, Steven Burg, John Plotz and Leslie Griffith joined the Senate in order to express their ideas on the qualities and attributes necessary for the faculty representatives to the search committee, from their perspective as representatives to the Board of Trustees. Susan Lanser sent an email to the Senate with her thoughts, since she could not attend the meeting. Much of what was discussed centered on how to adequately represent complexity of the academy. The role of the representatives was discussed in regards to their ability to interact with the board and the role that they will play in this committee and in this search process. The Faculty Representatives to the Board of Trustees stressed the importance of not only the selection process, but also the percentage of faculty participating in the search at this level.

Voting for the Faculty Representatives to the Presidential Search Committee
The Chair of the Senate received 110 nominations in all, for 33 candidates, 20 of which said they were willing and able to serve. The second half of the Senate meeting was devoted to the vote on the 20 nominees who had agreed to serve. It was decided, by the Senate Council, to employ a 0,1,2,3 method of voting. A “0” vote would serve as a vote against a candidate, as a mean score would be assigned to each nominee. A “blank” vote would not affect the ultimate mean score and would serve as a non-vote, neither for or against. A “3” vote would strongly support a candidate’s election to the committee. It was decided that, after the votes were tallied, the Senate would review the rankings of the candidates to determine if a run-off vote, by the same method, would be required, or if the scores clearly indicated the front-runners after the first vote. It was decided that it would not be appropriate or useful to discuss the nominees prior to the voting. The vote took place by secret ballot.

CARS Committee
While the votes were being tallied, the Senate discussed the possible reconvening of the CARS Committee and/or the creation of a new CARS Committee. This committee would be charged with overseeing the implementation of the CARS report. Some felt that the Dean’s Curriculum Committee was already fulfilling that role. The comment was
made that it seemed appropriate to reinstate the CARS committee, with the same members, as the faculty who generated the report would have a stake in seeing the recommendations fulfilled. Some concerns were expressed about the time commitment. The comment was made that overseeing the implementation of the report would not require the same type of commitment and that this committee would serve more as a type of infrastructure. It was agreed that the Senate could not move on a recommendation until the Provost had provided a clear charge for the committee.

**Voting Results**
The Senate reviewed the results of the vote and determined that there was a significant distinction between the top 11 candidates and the remaining 9, and therefore, it would not be necessary to hold a run-off vote in the 0,1,2,3 style. However, because the number of faculty representatives to the search committee has not been finalized yet, it was decided that the Senate would “rank order” the top eleven nominees in their order of preference. This vote took place, again by secret ballot.

The meeting adjourned at 7:00pm.