By-Laws Committee Minutes
November 2, 2012

In attendance: Glenn Lesses, Rick Heldrick, Susan Farrell, Sarah Owens, Lynn Cherry, Deanna Caveny-Noecker

1. Glenn Lesses reported that Heather Alexander is still trying to track down when the language requiring the majority of members of Senate committees to be Senators dropped out of the FAM. While this language no longer appears in the FAM, the requirement still exists on the Senate website. We’re trying to clear up the inconsistency.

2. Glenn reported as well that he’d spoken with Burton Callicott about the motion from the Academic Planning Committee we’d considered at our Oct. 5 meeting. Burton will ask his committee to address the issue of the number of faculty members that should be on Academic Planning.

3. FAM Revisions. We continued our discussion of Deanna Caveny-Noecker’s proposed FAM revisions, focusing on the following specific issues:

   a. Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Policies (pp. 68-69). After some discussion, we agreed that, while we might want to leave in a sentence or two from the newly proposed first paragraph, this section of the FAM should direct readers to the policy website.

   b. Committees of the College (beginning on p. 44). In general, we still found the language here confusing. We wondered what was meant by the phrase, “committees of the college.” Doesn’t this implicitly refer to ALL faculty committees? We agreed that there are certain standing committees (like Sustainability) that should be under administrative control. But Senate committees and faculty committees should NOT. We agreed that Deanna would work to clarify this language with Brian McGee.

   c. Code of Conduct (p. 59+). Because this policy seems to apply specifically to faculty, we thought it should stay in the FAM, but we were concerned that the FAM language should match the language on the college’s policy website. We decided that we could insert language at the policy website that says the FAM is the authority in this case (and that a link back to the FAM could be included on the policy site as well).

   d. Sabbaticals (pp. 164-165). We discussed the timing of sabbaticals as well as the issue of Senior Instructors and sabbaticals. We wondered if the new language would disallow sabbaticals for Senior Instructors because of the emphasis on “intensive research” and “creative activities” and “professional development.” Perhaps the word “or” would be more appropriate than “and” here? We concluded that Deanna would bring this issue up with the Faculty Welfare Committee and keep the By-Laws Committee updated.

   e. Board of Trustees and Annual Evaluation of Administrators (pp. 40-41; p. 75). We agreed to discuss these changes via e-mail because of time constraints. Later, on e-mail, we agreed that the proposed changes were acceptable.