

Report of the Faculty Senate committee on [Senate Review Recommendations 4, 5, & 8](#)
(Committee members: Grau (chair), Busch, Keeling, Cohen)

This committee was charged with making recommendations to the Faculty Senate regarding the following recommendations of the Faculty Senate Review Committee:

4. A review of survey respondents' comments indicates faculty suggested revised governance structures that would ensure a greater chance of representation for traditionally under-represented departments or structures that would ensure proportional representation for faculty constituencies. The Faculty Senate may wish to consider revising the current governance structure to satisfy these aims.
5. According to the "Getting Started Week Packet," numbers of faculty indicate that there is not a balance of representation across the divisions (LA, SB, SSPS, S&T). Thus, the Faculty Senate may wish to consider realigning the division composition or division representation on the senate to better reflect the actual faculty composition.
8. There is no formal mechanism for departments to change divisions, if they wish to do so. The Faculty Senate should consider adding language to the handbook, such as "A department may seek reclassification in the current division structure by submitting a written request to the Faculty Senate for consideration."

re: item 8 – the committee suggests the following language be added to the University Handbook (XVII.B.3.b.1):

Any department that wishes to change its "area" can petition the Faculty Senate, in writing (electronic submission), providing a rationale for such change. The petition must be submitted no later than the end of the 4th week of the semester preceding the effective date of the proposed change. After receipt of the request for change, the Faculty Senate will hold a two-week comment period, during which the responses from other departments in both affected "areas" will be solicited. The Senate will then vote at its next meeting on the request. If approved, the change will be submitted to the General Faculty for a vote.

re: item 5 - the committee recommends that the current areas (S&T, LA, SSPS, SoB) remain as they are, but that the allocation of Senators for the LA area increase from 4 to 6 Senators. This would increase the size of the faculty senate from 15 to 17; given the increase in the total size of the faculty, this is not unwarranted.

The Constitution of the Faculty Senate would thus be changed to read

*“Membership shall consist of ...four at-large members from the areas of science & technology, and social sciences and professional studies, **and six at-large members from the area of liberal arts.**”* (Handbook XVII.B.3.b.lines 16-18)

The last line of that same paragraph would be changed to read

*“...and three of the four senators for SSPS and S & T, **and four of the six senators from LA must be tenured members of the faculty.**”*

(Handbook XVII.B.3.b.lines 21-22)

RATIONALE: as the attached data (available:

http://facultysenate.cnu.edu/06_07/misc/SenRevRec/AcadAreas.xls) indicate, LA has many more faculty than the other 2 CLAS areas. If one calculates the average number of faculty per senator, and then divides this quotient into the total faculty per “area”, the result indicates that while S & T and SSPS should have 4 senators each, LA should have 6. The committee felt this was more feasible than re-organizing the existing areas, as the current areas provide the best “coherence” among the departments within each.

re: item 4 – the consensus of the committee was to not change the at-large system of electing senators by area (except with the change noted above). In an effort to increase the representation of “traditionally underrepresented departments” the committee recommends the following: (1) change the balloting procedure from the current “sequential” ballot system to a “simultaneous” ballot for the senate seats, i.e., one ballot for both seats, with the top two vote-getters being elected. Provisions would have to be made to ensure that the electees do not exceed the non-tenured limits for that area (which should increase to 2 senators for LA). Thus the handbook would be changed to read: (under “Voting process”)

“3) The two candidates receiving the greatest and second-greatest number of votes shall be elected, unless doing so would exceed the limits of non-tenured faculty for that area, in which case the tenured candidate with the next highest vote total would be elected.”

(Handbook XVII.B.3.d.; item #4 would be removed)

RATIONALE: under the “sequential” system, larger departments can “out-vote” any smaller departments on each ballot; with a simultaneous ballot, smaller departments can “vote together” to elect a candidate from a smaller department.

The committee also recommends that the Senate make every effort to increase the participation of “traditionally underrepresented” departments in the Senate election process by actively soliciting nominees from said departments for each senate election, and by increasing the awareness among the faculty of the patterns of departmental representation that have occurred in past senates.