October 31, 2000

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The third regular meeting of the Faculty Senate convened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, October 31, in Room 116 of the Education Center, Speaker of the Faculty Trisha Folds-Bennett presiding. Fifty-two senators attended. Susan Morrison served as Parliamentarian pro tempore, substituting for George Pothering. The Minutes of the previous meeting (October 3) were approved as circulated.

Reports

The Speaker

Trisha Folds-Bennett spoke briefly about a conference of the AAUP and said that she would share some information about it with the senate at a later time. Meanwhile, she announced that the Post-Tenure Review Committee had asked that their items on the agenda be withdrawn, to be taken up at a later date. This was being done to expedite the election of faculty representatives to the Presidential Search Committee, which had to be completed immediately. She suggested rearranging the order of business for today’s meeting in order to accommodate this election; there were no objections.

New Business

Tom Kunkle, for the Committee on Nominations and Elections, introduced the following motion on election procedures:

The Faculty Senate shall elect two faculty members to the Presidential Search Committee (``PSC'') by the following criteria, listed in order of precedence.
Criterion 1:
The senate shall elect two faculty members from different schools including the library.

*Voting Rule (In support of Criterion 1):*

In any one round of votes, a senator can vote for at most (the number of remaining vacancies on the PSC) candidates, and cannot vote for two candidates from the same school or library. [This incorporates a friendly amendment made by Beverly Diamond, on behalf of one of her constituents, and accepted by the Nominating Committee.]

Criterion 2:
The elected candidates must receive votes from more than half of the valid ballots cast by senators present (a "majority"). After each round of voting, if two candidates have not been elected, then the candidate or candidates receiving the fewest votes will be eliminated from the ballots.

As a consequence of these criteria and voting rule, the senate shall use the election procedure described as follows.

In any one round of votes, if the leader (the candidate who received the most votes) has a majority, then that candidate is elected, and his/her school/library is eliminated from further consideration. If the leader from the remaining candidates also has a majority of votes, and if there is still a vacancy on the PSC, then that person is also elected.

After a round of votes, if two faculty have not been elected, or in the event of a tie, then the candidate(s) with the fewest votes is eliminated from the ballot and another round of votes is cast.

*Rationale:* Electing two faculty members from two different schools will increase diversity on the PSC.

Without restricting senators from voting for two candidates from the same school or library, small schools have a disproportionally small chance of having a winning candidate.

The elimination method has the advantage that it minimizes the incentive for strategic or insincere voting, and helps to ensure that no candidate is elected without the approval of a majority of senators.
During the discussion, Beverly Diamond suggested a friendly amendment for the Voting Rule (In support of Criterion 1). This was accepted, and is incorporated in the text of the motion, as given above. Before the main motion was voted on, and after considerable debate, it was clarified that the phrase "valid ballot" did not include blank ballots, i.e., ballots from senators who chose to vote for no one. The interpretation of this phrase was important to the calculation of a majority.

Rick Heldrich insisted that, on a matter of such importance, the faculty need to trust each other to do the right thing and not try to manipulate the voting regulations. James Deavor moved to amend the motion by striking the first Criterion, but this was not approved. Mr. Heldrich then referred to the potential problem of unbalancing the search committee by electing someone from the same School as the Speaker, who would be serving ex officio. He moved to amend the motion to say that “No faculty member can be elected from the same School as the Speaker.” Franklin Ashley spoke against this, on the ground that the Speaker represents the whole faculty, not just the School of which he or she is a member, and Rohn England agreed. This amendment also failed, on a voice vote. When the question was finally called, the main motion passed, as amended, on a voice vote.

Mr. Kunkle then formally placed the following slate of names in nomination for the Presidential Search Committee:

Sheila Seaman (Library)
Mary Beth Heston (Art History)
Michael Morgan (Economics)
Monica Janas (Foundations, Secondary, & Special Education)
Hugh Wilder (Philosophy & Religious Studies)
Deanna Caveny (Mathematics)
Brian Scholtens (Biology)

In the event, Hugh Wilder was elected in the first round of voting, and Deanna Caveny on the second, by means of a written ballot. These results were reported later in the meeting. Meanwhile, business proceeded.

Lynn Cherry, on behalf of the Curriculum Committee, introduce five motions

F00001 New Program: French Studies Minor
F00009 New Course: RELS 205 -- Sacred Texts of the East (3hrs.)
F00013 New Course: COMM 325 -- Humor Writing (3)
F00014 Renumber Music Courses
These were approved without change. Caroline Hunt moved to return the fifth motion, a proposed new course in Spanish Dialectology, to the Curriculum Committee, with instructions to clarify the question of Humanities credit. The motion to remand passed, on a voice vote:

[F00015  New Course: SPAN 447 -- Spanish Dialectology (3): remanded]

Rohn England, for the Committee on Graduate Education, moved to delete two graduate courses in the Master of Environmental Studies Program, EVSS 692, and 699. This was approved.

Mr. England, speaking again for the Graduate Committee, and Walter Pharr, on behalf of the Academic Standards Committee, then introduced two parallel motions concerned with the way student practice–teaching is graded:

(1) Proposal to Change Grading for Student Teaching in the M. A. T. Programs

The Graduate Education Committee and Graduate Council move that the grading for M. A. T. student teaching be changed to satisfactory (s) or unsatisfactory (u) for the following student teaching courses:

EDFS 797: Student Teaching in Special Education
EDEE 698: Student Teaching in Early Childhood Education
EDEE 699: Student Teaching in Elementary Education

Rationale: To a great extent, performance during student teaching is related to the placement setting and cooperating teacher. The student teacher does not have input into this placement. The placement, to a large extent, is a result of those certified teachers (required to have at least three years of experience) who agree to have a student teacher. Additionally, there is a performance-based, state-adopted evaluation system (ADEPT - Assisting, Developing, and Evaluating Professional Teaching) which is used for student and provisional (first year) teachers and is not grade related. Given the numerous variables associated with the student teaching course, the grades that are awarded are not comparable. Additionally, when a grade of A is awarded for student teaching, it greatly inflates the student's GPA because the course credit for M. A. T. student teaching is nine hours.

(Endorsed by:
EDEE and EDFS Graduate Program Directors
EDEE and EDFS Departments
School of Education Administrative Council
Faculty Committee on Graduate Education
Graduate Council)
Proposal to Change Grading for Student Teaching in the Undergraduate Education Programs

The Academic Standards Committee moves that the grading for undergraduate student teaching be changed to pass (p) or no pass (np) for the following student teaching courses:

EDFS 440: Student Teaching in Special Education
EDEE 450: Student Teaching in Elementary Education
EDFS 460: Student Teaching in Secondary Education

Rationale: To a great extent, performance during student teaching is related to the placement setting and cooperating teacher. The student teacher does not have input into this placement. The placement, to a large extent, is a result of those certified teachers (required to have at least three years of experience) who agree to have a student teacher. Additionally, there is a performance-based, state-adopted evaluation system (ADEPT - Assisting, Developing, and Evaluating Professional Teaching) which is used for student and provisional (first year) teachers and is not grade related. Given the numerous variables associated with the student teaching course, the grades that are awarded are not comparable. Additionally, when a grade of A is awarded for student teaching, it greatly inflates the student's GPA because the course credit for undergraduate student teaching is 12 hours.

(Endorsed by:
EDEE and EDFS Departments
School of Education Administrative Council
All-College Certification Committee
Faculty Committee on Academic Standards)

During the discussion, Paige Wisotzka said that she thought the undergraduate part of the proposal would actually be harmful to some students in Languages who were considering becoming teachers, and she spoke against the measure. Caroline Hunt essentially agreed, saying that some of our best students are at risk, especially those who think that, just because they love the subjects they are studying at College, they want to become teachers. Such students may be in for a rude shock when they enter the classroom and suddenly realize that many high-school students are not as enthusiastic about learning as they are. Some find this out too late, and eventually become disillusioned with the whole school system, with potentially unfortunate results all around. We need to advise our students earlier than we do, if they are considering becoming teachers, about what they can realistically expect in the classroom, so that they do not make unfortunate career choices.
After the question was called, the senate approved a motion to separate the two proposals. Both passed, on separate voice votes.

Constituents’ Concerns & Adjournment

Final results of the balloting for the Presidential Search Committee were reported at the end of the meeting, and the Secretary doggedly insisted that the College’s tradition of not embarrassing the losers by putting the actual vote-count into the Minutes would be respected. The ballots, however, would be carefully preserved in case anyone wished to call for a hand re-count.

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at about 6:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bishop Hunt
Faculty Secretary

*******
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