The dean welcomed everyone back for another semester and shared how he would like the meeting to proceed since there is no School Moderator. He noted as dean, he may call a meeting, however, he stressed the need for a School Moderator and that someone needs to step forward for this. Nominations will be requested for someone to act as a moderator for today’s meeting only. The meeting will then be turned over to the moderator. This procedure is within Roberts Rules of Order.

Prior to requests for School Moderator nominations, the dean shared the following updates.

Facilities Update

The third floor occupants of Dunn Hall is scheduled to move out in April. After modest renovations are completed, ICT as well as a media lab will move into the space this summer. Renovations to the old University Police space in Dunn Hall are expected to begin in April and be completed by August. The Community Health Department will move to this space in the summer. The former Migrant Education space will also be renovated this summer. Plans for to create four offices, each having a window. Satterlee 304 will be divided into two offices this summer. By next Fall, everyone should have a decent office.

Linda Seramur noted a concern that the Literacy Grant was moved to Van Housen Hall and would not be linked to the Literacy Center. The dean reported there has actually been no connected between the Literacy Grant and the Center; the grant people were offered Migrant Education space, however, preferred to move to Van Housen Hall.

Standards

The dean often receives questions from faculty and students if adequate standards are maintained in programs. This is an important issue and should be an important them for next year. Faculty will need to look at what is expected of our students as well as if the kinds of students being admitted. Faculty will need to look at this and come up with a
plan. The dean plans to address this at his opening meeting next year. He asks faculty to think about this and deal with this as a School. Each department and program will be involved in some way. Department meetings should be discussing this issue.

Personnel

The dean believes this is one of the most important things we do is act on reappointment decisions that come through. This drives the entire institution and the people we have determine whether the college is good or mediocre. It is essential the process used in making a decision is fair and must transcend personalities. This will protect the faculty member and the institution. The Personnel Committee was established to provide objectivity. Personality problems can affect department recommendations which should not be based on this. Recommendations should be based on the person’s record. Departments can sometimes be unwilling to make difficult decisions. The importance of this issue warrants discussion and consideration.

A motion was made by Sandy Chadwick to nominate Linda Seramur as moderator for today’s meeting, seconded by Kathy Valentine. Vote taken, motion carried.

Linda noted this is the time to come together and make important decisions as a school.

Sergei Abramovich presented the motion from the Personnel Committee.

The Personnel Committee will:
"Upon request of the faculty member under review, or the department chair acting on the expressed will of the department faculty, make recommendations to the Dean regarding applications of School members for personnel action (reappointment, continuing or permanent appointment, promotion, or leave). Requests must be made to the Chair of the SOE&PS Personnel Committee no later than two weeks prior to the date that the review materials are due to the Dean."

Some history behind the proposed amendment was shared by committee members. The Personnel Committee discussed that perhaps the committee should not review faculty and that faculty should be reviewed only by the department. The committee felt this was a compromise and was an attempt to address some issues. This would allow a faculty member to request a second level of review or allow the department another option. The Personnel Committee would be involved in other issues. The proposed amendment was sent out December as a result of Personnel Committee discussions. The vote on the committee to send the proposal was 5 yes, 0 against, 2 abstentions. To make this a democratic process, each member of the committee was asked to go back to their department and bring feedback back to the committee.

A concern was noted this could funnel to the personnel committee only those candidates that are problematic or would make a sense of a problem about a faculty member. It may however, be simply that the department is small or the department might want a second level of review.
A concern of the Personnel Committee was that under the new structure, there are more teacher education departments. A concern was also noted about the workload of the members of the committee. A brief discussion took place regarding options and possible release time for committee members.

A suggestion was made to make an editorial change. Changes must be approved by the President.

Several faculty asked if a vote would be taken today.

The question was called by Julie, Reagan, seconded by Sandy.

Sergei noted a secret ballot would be used.

Linda stated faculty would be voting on closing the discussion and move to vote. She asked for a vote to close the question. Vote taken, motion carried to vote on proposed amendment to the faculty by-laws.

It was noted that 2/3 of the voting members was need to carry the motion.

Ron noted a concern about the five people on sabbaticals/academic leave.

The result of the vote was 31 yes/approve, 6 no, 6 abstentions. Motion not carried.

A motion to adjourn was made by Kathy Valentine at 12:55 p.m.

Linda stated the concerns about people on leave would be researched with Ed Alfonsin.

Peter stated any voting member may bring an item for consideration for bylaws amendment. This requires a two week notice and a meeting to vote on it.

It was stressed that a school moderator is really needed.

It was asked if people on leave could be polled by a paper ballot.

Linda stated the proposal was voted down. We would have to come back and move that this be sent as a paper ballot. The governance process must be followed.

Ron Bretsch stated he questions changing the rules during the middle of the year. If bringing an amendment, please speak to the effective date. This might jeopardize those involved. People are already in the middle of the reappointment process. He suggested an effective date of next year.

A motion to adjourn was made by Kathy O’Rourke, seconded by Sergei Abramovich. Motion carried. Meeting adjourned 1:05 p.m.