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Senators (or proxies) present: Doug Allen, Lynn Baker (Jack Sheinbaum proxy), Linda Bensel-Meyers, Eric Boschmann, Jeff Bowen (also proxy for Doug Allen), Ryan Buller, John Campbell (proxy, unidentified), Victor Castellani, Ruth Chao, Sara Chatfield, Frédérique Chevillot, Kate Crowe, David Daniels, Jared Del Rosso (John Hill proxy), Ron DeLyser, Claude d’Estree, Peter Dobelis, Xin Fan, Brian Garity (proxy for Gwen Vogel Mitchell), Kingshuk Ghosh, James Gilroy, Sarah Hart-Micke, Darrin Hicks, John Hill, Deborah Howard, Barbekka Hurtt, Scott Johns, Megan Kelly, Cheyne Kirkpatrick (Melanie Witt proxy), Judy Kiyama, Michelle Knowles, Paul Kosempel, Christina Kreps, Michelle Kruse-Crocker, Mario Lopez, Zulema Lopez, Kevin Lynch (proxy for Michael Siebecker and An necoos Wiersma), Brian Majestic, Krystyna Matusiak, Steven Mayer, Julianne Mitchell (proxy for Shannon Silva), Kevin O’Brien, Ronnie Pavlov (proxy for Andrew Linshaw), Sarah Pessin, Andi Pusavat, Carl Raschke, Chip Reichardt, Martin Rhodes, Jason Roney, Nancy Sampson, Aaron Schneider (proxy for Raul Perez), Lynn Schofield Clark, David Schott, Jonathan Sciarcon, Jamie Shapiro (proxy for Nicole Taylor), Orna Shaughnessy, Derigan Silver, Dan Singer, Amrik Singh, Emily Sposeto, Mary Stansbury (proxy for Pat Garriott), Kate Stoker, Billy J. Stratton, Matthew Taylor, Ron Throupe, Scott Toney, Greg Ungar, Robert Urquhart, Ann Vessels, Stephen von Merz, Eugene Walls, Sarah Watamura (Tim Sweeney proxy), Duan Zhang.

The meeting was called to order at noon. The February and March minutes were approved as distributed.

Annual Athletics Update: Keith Miller, Peg Bradley-Dop pes, Carlton Kreech

Peg Bradley-Dop pes:
Peg is the current Vice-Chancellor of Athletics and Recreation, and is 9 days from the end of her very successful tenure.

• GPA/Graduation Rate: Student-athletes are truly both – they have an average GPA of 3.35, well above the national average, with 330 total Division I student-athletes. Peg noted the importance of our small class sizes, and faculty engagement and willingness to work to support student-athletes, which has led to a 94% graduation success rate. Even for students who leave the University of Denver early to pursue professional careers in sports, the University maintains a degree completion program. The 5 hockey players we lost to the NHL, we track them to make sure that even though they are no longer at the University of Denver, they can still get a degree.

• Title IX Equity: We are completely Title IX equitable, something Peg credits to people who preceded her by more than a decade - Joy Burns, Diane Wendt, and Dan Ritchie.

• Athletic Success: We’ve won 9 out of the past 10 I-AAA Director’s Cup. We’re by far the most successful athletic program in the country without football, with 17 sport
programs and are competing against universities with 25-30 teams, making our victory even more impressive. We are already so far ahead this year that it’s mathematically impossible to catch us, so we’re about to win another. Even if you do include all of the schools with a football program, we still finish in top 35-45. Our mix of academic and athletic success is difficult to achieve – there are only a handful, schools like USC, Stanford, etc. Faculty are a huge part of how special the university is and how successful the student-athletes are.

Peg introduced Carlton Kreech, the new Vice Chancellor of Athletics and Recreation. She is confident that Provost Kvistad and Trustee John Miller did an amazing job and that DU has found someone who can provide needed leadership, continue to push, has our values, and will keep things going on the right track for the next 10-15 years.

*Carlton Kreech:* Peg has an impeccable national reputation – she’s a pioneer in the true sense of the word, and it shows in how she has built this program. This program and university is what attracted him - they have built the model NCAA Division I program, committed to comprehensive success across the board athletically and academically, and the faculty should be very proud of this. He also noted that he is grateful to be in Denver, as he’s coming from the University of Maine, and is looking forward to snow that comes and then goes. He taught at Maine, in the Business School, and it was very helpful, gave him a great, different perspective on students than being the athletic director, and he looks forward to doing the same thing at DU. Kreech does not officially start until May 1st. He’s been there a few weeks, and his main focus at the moment is getting to know people and building relationships.

Kate Willink asked if anyone had questions for Peg or Carlton. Deb Sampson: More a comment – on the 30th from 3:30-5, there is a reception in Hamilton Gymnasium to thank Peg for all her service to the University. Kate W. invited Keith Miller, former Faculty Athletics Representative, chair of FAC, to talk about Peg because he is so familiar and can express our gratitude.

*Keith Miller:* Peg’s been here 13 years, and she is notable for her leadership at the university, conference, and national level. At DU, you probably know she works on the Senior Leadership Team. She was also instrumental in the Women’s Leadership Council. We have and are in one of the best hockey conferences, and Peg was instrumental in creating the NCHC (National Collegiate Hockey Conference), arguably the best collegiate hockey conference in the nation – so good that some people call it the SEC of hockey (aside from Peg: with good academics!). At the national level, in addition to what Carlton mentioned, she has served on high-ranking committees for Division I volleyball, Olympic Sports committees, also the NCAA Division I Leadership Council, the most prestigious of these groups – as the Athletic Director at a non-football school, it’s indicative of her abilities and talents that she is serving at the highest level. For those of you who have followed DU athletics for a long time, you know Peg has led us through a transformation, to success at every level. We have over 100 conference titles, and recently we have our 8th national championship. I also want everyone to know that she is our advocate and students’ advocate - she always puts students first and student-athletes first. It’s always a pleasure to work with her, and we always know where we stand. She personally looks
at all of those midterm grades, she really does – if students don’t compete in the classroom, they don’t compete on the field. The other thing that’s impressive is that with Peg and Nancy Sampson, they have pushed our students to go on to graduate school. Go up to the 3rd floor and look at the big trophy of all the student-athletes we have sent on for graduate work. As a scholar as an academician I really appreciate this. She’s exceptional, she inspires everyone around her. She has been our strongest advocate for putting “student” first in student-athlete first.

President’s Report
This is Kate’s 2nd to last Senate meeting as president. She reminded Senators that the upcoming meeting is the last business meeting, and at the final meeting of the year, the Senate will be doing a lot of voting and bringing in Senators at our next meeting. Make sure you communicate this to your incoming Senators, and be aware that this will take up a good chunk of the final meeting.

Administrator Evaluations: Every other year the Senate is partially responsible for the administrator evaluations. Last year would have been the year the Senate sent out evaluations, but since this was an in-house evaluation, we felt that it was not a good return on investment to spend tens of thousands of dollars on an 11% return rate using our current system, and thought we could do better. Representatives from the Senate, Provost Office, and Institutional Research are piloting a new administrator evaluation form that will be sent out for faculty AND staff from May 8-18th. Please take back to all of your constituents that this admin evaluation is coming and that we would love them to participate. We are partnering with Modern Think, a company that does a survey that gets reported in “Great Colleges To Work For,” so we can benchmark our progress against ourselves as well as other institutions. It’s a pilot, so there will be qualitative questions asked to hopefully improve the survey. Our goal is 50% which, given past response rates, would be a minor miracle, and then that feedback will come back to administrators with steps for action. This is particularly significant, as we have an incoming Provost in mid-July, and this will be a great way for him to get to know our institution. Mary Stansbury: Will the results be available publicly? Kate Willink: Yes, they will be in PioneerWeb, but I’ll show you where exactly in a bit. I also know that there were some concerns about the personal data – Modern Think will be the repository of information collected, not the University of Denver.

Faculty Senate Service Profile: Kate began to address this in February 2017 as a way of addressing concerns about “usual suspects” and making sure that Faculty Senate’s Executive Committee had enough information about the faculty to make recommendations. In PioneerWeb, all faculty will have a tab that invites them to sign up and indicate their expertise in committee work and the topic areas they want to serve in. There is also a “yes/no” tab that allows you to turn off the tab if you are serving on sabbatical, or writing a book, etc. The information will be retained, and will enable Senate to have a consistent pool of folks to pull from when asked.
Kate asked for input on current categories of “skills and expertise” and “topical areas of interest” as proposed, or any questions, and there were no questions. She then asked for feedback on additional information not asked for in these categories in their draft form. Suggested additions for both categories included: Arts, Advocacy, Communication, International Education, Assessment, Grant Proposal Review, Expertise in Project Management, and Outreach and Community Partnerships, Digital Humanities, Research and Scholarship, Faculty Development, and Intellectual Property.

The “Faculty Senate” widget in Pioneerweb will also include this “Faculty Senate Service Profile.” The profile will be live in the next few weeks. Please make sure that your colleagues know about it, especially make sure new colleagues to the institution know about so they are considered when we are thinking about committees. Sarah Chatfield: Would you have to be a Senator to fill this out? Kate: This is for all faculty, not just Senators. Matt Taylor: Can you change it to “Faculty Service Profile” as otherwise it sounds like you’re volunteering for Senate service, not more broadly? Kate: Yes, that’s a good observation, we’ll change that. Doug Allen: Can the profile pull from other demographic data not entered by the person? Kate: it’s all whatever information is tied to your 87#, so yes.

Committee on University Search Committees:
The Executive Committee will make a motion on University Search Committees, and that won’t be done until next fall. If you look at my issues at the beginning of my presidency, this is something that I’ve wanted to do since the beginning, as who serves in positions of authority in higher education administration is so important to faculty. We will make a call for nominations and self-nominations for folks who want to serve. This announcement, and more details, will be coming out as of May 12th from Darrin Hicks, but will be discussed at the first Senate meeting of the 2018-2019 year. Kate explained that we don’t introduce new motions the last business meeting when the 1/3 of the folks will be new Senators and wouldn’t have heard the first reading. It is a legit concern and I will be happy to pass that on and support Darrin.

How to Introduce a Motion (Motions 101):
Your Intention to propose a motion should come during the “New Business” section of the meeting. Since the Senate follows Robert’s Rules of Order, and we realized that we hadn’t consistently included “New Business,” which is a standard part of Robert’s Rules where members of a body can introduce new motions, we have added New Business as a consistent part of every agenda to allow for any Senator to introduce a motion into process, and to alert and notify other Senators that a motion is making its way through the motion onto the floor as a formal first reading, rather than our usual past practice of having motions originate in committee. The Senate also wants to be sure there is a time and place for every Senator to express concerns. Our New Senator handbook and constitution includes how to put forward a motion, but that process is not always crystal clear, and so our Communications Director, Megan Kelly, and Kate Willink, have been working on a one-page document to include on the Senate website to clarify the process. For introduction of motions, we ask Senators to prepare a one-paragraph summary of their motion. The motion will then be moved by the person making the motion, or the Senate President, to one of the committees. The person who is introducing it
to the Senate needs to provide it to the President and the Secretary, which will ensure that it makes it accurately into the minutes.

Another issue we’ve realized is that it’s fairly opaque is what happens when a motion goes into a committee for deliberation and discussion. The process typically involves the Executive Committee putting the motion to be discussed on a future Senate agenda. The motion is announced when the President circulates the agenda 5 days in advance, or 30 days in advance for constitutional changes. This allows Senators time for deliberation, consultation, and notification of stakeholders in their units who might be impacted. Then we have a first reading, which involves open floor debate and amendments. The second reading is usually the meeting right after the first reading, where we do a continuation of discussion and the vote. For some very complex issues with wide-ranging impact – for example, the document on Policies and Procedures for Professional Development which took 3-4 votes and deliberation by 3-4 Senate committees and 3-4-committee discussions – the deliberative process can take more than 1 cycle, or even more than 2 terms of the Senate. The process can feel Byzantine, but the intent is to allow for deliberation and consideration. We know that when we have 3 votes, 3 motions, and 3 years, if there are communication issues, we’ve at least done our due diligence in allowing time and space for communication and deliberation. Kate gave an example of recently running in to Hava Gordon at a coffee shop, and used it as an example of why that communication and deliberation is so important – because her Senator (Jared del Rosso) had communicated the most recent agenda items to his constituents, Hava knew exactly what was to be discussed at subsequent meeting, and was informed enough to have an opinion on several issues. This is exactly what should be happening.

**Constitution & Bylaws Revision Motion Second Reading**

*Faculty Review Committee:*

For this particular revision, Kate has asked Scott Phillips, chair of the Faculty Review Committee (FRC), to join us so that he can give some more context. This is necessary because there is a firewall between the Senate and FRC, so any specific questions would need to be answered by Scott. The motion to be voted on would increase the numbers on the FRC from 12-17, which would enable the committee to meet quorum requirements, as most cases come up over the summer, and keeping quorum size at 7 in the summer is difficult.

*Scott Phillips:* The primary reason we’ve asked for this revision is, as Kate mentioned, it’s difficult to get enough people for a quorum over the summer, which is very stressful given the very high stakes of these cases. In every case, FRC has had to ask Greg Kvistad/the Provost for an extension, as the outlined timeline is often not realistic given the complexity and the confidentiality of the cases, especially given the difficulty in meeting quorum requirements. Often there are multiple units involved in each case, and in order to sort through that complexity in 30 days, we have 3-4 hours meeting, and getting 7 out of 17 people is far easier than 7 out of 12. The change in terms to end in fall accommodates the usual pattern of cases arising in the spring because of tenure and promotion denials. Currently, the chairs and the members end their terms at the last meeting, which is early May. With this in mind, it’s conceivable that a case could arise in the next 21 days and over the course of a case you have 2
different chairs with 2 different committees hearing 2 different cases. The change in terms to end in fall allows for more consistency, which would give the chair 6-9 months to get up and running, to talk to Counsel, HR, other people involved, develop a working relationship, so that when cases do arise you don’t have to jump in, feet first, having been chair for 3-4 days.

Frédérique: Point of clarification. If you have 2 reps from one division, would only 1 individual serve? Kate: That came up at the last meeting, and was a concern that only Scott could answer. Other committees like IRB, are carefully calibrated so that understanding and expertise are distributed equitably. In the matters that FRC addresses, does it matter which units are being represented, or would it be an issue to have 2 members from 1 division? Scott: I think the key question is whether any member has too close of a relationship with the faculty member who filed, and we’ve had people recuse themselves. That aside, I don’t see why two social scientists, for example, couldn’t serve. There are provisions allow individual members to be appointed if it’s necessary for diversity – if it just so happened that the committee didn’t have enough women, the committee is empowered to address it. Sarah Pessin: This idea seems great so much so that I want to ask if there is a minus to this change, this seems so obviously “pro.” Scott: The only negatives I can see is the the possibility that the meetings would have different people in the room over the course of one case, but even when that has happened people have been very conscientious if they weren’t able to attend all of the meetings. Senator: It looks as though the highest possible number should be 18, not 17 – is that correct? John Hill: I’ll explain that! 18 is the correct number, the reason it’s 17 is, for reasons I don’t understand, the Writing Program, which has 26 faculty was not listed, and Scott does not currently have a Writing Program representative. Another thing, we have a little over 820 appointed faculty at DU, and about 615 of them are on 9-10 month contracts, which shows the importance of having a larger body to pull from and the issue with summer quorums. Brian Gearity: Why aren’t we discussing that we’re asking people to work over the summer for a 9-month contract on this very important committee? Kate: Right now, the time cycle and the commitment that we make to honor our commitment to our colleagues necessitates the change. Any change in the timing and workflow of the committee would necessitate a change in the tenure schedule. In addition, those folks who would come to that committee have only so many days to deliberate and only so many days to respond. It would be hard to put our colleagues on pause because of contract timelines. That said, it’s a good question and an important one to raise. Christina Kreps: Would it be possible for the committee to explore how other universities deal with these same timeline issues? For example, universities that have faculty unions – once that June or May date, they’re gone, they are not obligated to do anything. Looking at other places, could we look at alternatives, what other places do.

Kate closed by asking all of us to thank Scott for stepping in and serving in this really significant service role, especially since it’s usually in the “shadows” – this work is really significant and we appreciate everything that you and your committee does, and please pass this on to the rest of the committee. John Hill: Moving on – we’ll vote on the FRC change when we vote along with all the others proposed changes.
To sum up, again, the FEAC change just alters the constitution so it reflects our current practice. The quorum change is from 40-50%, and we do have a quorum of 75% today. Proxies are, in this form, fully empowered to vote, but Senators are limited to one proxy per Senator. Committee chairs will serve over the summer and through the first meeting in the following fall of the next academic year. The bylaws are changing to reflect past practice and allow us to waive having 2 readings of a motion with a 2/3 majority vote.

**Voting Results on Proposed Amendments to Constitution and Bylaws**

**Constitution**

FEAC, III.A.5—This establishes in the Constitution our current Senate practice: The Senate President, and Past-President or President-Elect, and one faculty member elected to a three-year term shall be representatives to the Board of Trustees Committee on Faculty and Educational Affairs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>82</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abst</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quorum Rules, IV.C.2—Increase quorum size from 40% to 50%. Several Senators have commented that it seems unreasonable, if not unwise, that only 40% of Senators could pass motions on behalf of the Senate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>78</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abst</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proxies, IV.C.3—Change to: A Senator who must be absent from a Senate meeting may designate any other faculty member to attend on her/his behalf. Such designation must be written and presented to the President at or before the beginning of the Senate meeting. A faculty member may serve as a proxy for only one Senator at a Senate meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>70</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abst</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Committee Chairs, V.C.5—Change Committee Chair term to two years and extend term until a new chair is elected in the fall. This aids Senate and Senate Executive Committee functioning over the summer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>80</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abst</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty Review Committee, VI.A.2.a.2—Set member terms to end in fall rather than spring. Arts and Humanities, Daniels College of Business, Natural Sciences and Mathematics, Social Sciences, and Sturm College of Law shall elect two members each; Joseph Korbel School of
International Studies, Graduate School of Professional Psychology, Graduate School of Social Work, Morgridge College of Education, Ritchie School of Engineering and Computer Science, University College, University Library, and Writing Program shall elect one member each. Most FRC work occurs over the summer. These changes make it easier to establish a quorum for cases and spread the workload.

Yes 77
No 3
Abstain 5

Bylaws
Voting on motions, II.C—This establishes in the By Laws our current Senate practice. Motions shall have two readings at separate Senate meetings. The second reading shall be waived if approved by a two-thirds (2/3) vote of the Senate.

Yes 77
No 4
Abstain 4

Kate: We will put those changes forward to the Board of Trustees to approve, as is required.

Senate Size Discussion
Kate Willink prefaced the discussion by saying that she and Billy had spent several hours coding table size discussion notes, and it became clear that people wanted to know more before voting. Executive Committee members are at each table to take notes which will inform next steps.

Darrin Hicks: First, I apologize for my presentation at the last meeting - I let my enthusiasm with design approaches to representational models dominate, and that shouldn’t have happened. There are several faculty who expressed grave concerns, and I agree that we should not reduce the size without near-complete consensus. So – based on data gathered, about 70% said you would like a smaller Senate, but not too small, somewhere between 45-60 members. Senators liked the idea of 1 person, 1 vote, and very few people liked the idea of proportional voting. Small units in divisions like AHSS wanted to have their own unit-specific person. The document we’re viewing is an attempt to be responsive to those concerns. What we did after looking at all this data, is attempt to move from a ratio of about 1:8 to a 1:20 ratio. We had some issues achieving this and still maintaining the goal of “units and departments each having 1 senator.”

At the very bottom left hand corner, there is an interger model based on faculty size to address these concerns, to proportionally represent everyone. The third from the last column on the chart, please notice that we broke up AHSS into two divisions (“Arts and Humanities” and “Social Sciences”), which we already do for promotion and tenure purposes. Another issue we’re attempting to address is that people have said they feel afraid or intimidated to speak on the full floor of the Senate. Since group size plays a decisive factor in whether people feel empowered to talk, we want to ensure that the Senate is size-optimized to ensure everyone feels empowered to speak.
Please take this document and this discussion back to your departments and divisions. Once we get through questions or comments, we’ll have an Executive Committee member or facilitator take notes at your table to ensure that this new model doesn’t have any issues we missed.

Doug Allen: For the final point, about all departments in AHSS having their own Senator — there are other divisions with multiple departments, but if other units have this concern, do we know? Darrin: No, that’s why we need to keep talking. We need John Hill here to check in on this, but in terms of series representation, we also actually think we have overrepresentation of non-tenure track faculty over tenure track. Matthew Taylor: For the sake of continuity, remind us why we’re having this discussion. Darrin: We’d heard from people that they weren’t talking on the Senate floor, we weren’t getting a diversity of voices, and one of our values is deliberative quality and transparency — the more people who can talk and express themselves the better. We don’t want a group of spectators watching the work of the Executive Committee, we want people constantly bringing new projects — we can’t do that if most people aren’t speaking. Robert Urquart: The first three points seem to be very different from the fourth (AHSS representation by department). I don’t want my desire for AHSS having unit representation to take away from other units. Darrin: Then you would say that in discussion — not everyone experiences these same things or may have those concerns. Kate: Right now AHSS is 30% of the total faculty and they would overall lose the most Senators. Victor Castellani: There are a lot of units that are very small, and then there is a jump between 4 and 25 total faculty — that seems to be part of the issue. He would request that as we go forward, we more explicitly tie to the Senate size to the stated and actual purpose. I have a significant concern about making a change of this kind without tying it directly to the function. If I take the language from the constitution, we are an advocacy organization, and need to be directly involved in this decision-making. I’m not sure I understand if or why this is tied to the mission. Kate Willink: We are also a legislative body, authoring policy — we are also doing this legislative function, and are the body that communicates to and through the Provost. There are certain things like Policies and Procedures for Faculty Development and Freedom of Expression that we’ve designed. They need to be approved, but we are the designers. We will continue this discussion in the fall if we decide that we, as a body, want to.

New Business
Aaron Schneider: I’ve prepared a motion to address something I’d like to speak to. The Provost Search alerted us to a problem which has been evident for a long time, which is that faculty voice on campus is weak. I want a university where faculty, students, staff, and service workers — everyone whose work is impacted by administrative hiring practices, to have a voice in those hiring practices — and for the hiring of academic administrators, faculty should have a central role. With help from the AAUP and feedback from Executive Committee members, I’ve come up with four proposed amendments to the current constitution, and have brought a proposal with markups. I would like feedback and a vigorous debate about how we design each of these amendments and come up with possible wording. My goal is to help to empower the Senate by giving us decision-making power in forming search committees for academic administration positions, seek to bring Faculty Senate closer to decision-making processes, and to ensure that Faculty Senate is drawing on the experience and legitimacy of the Faculty of Color Association (FOCA) to address issues of equity, diversity, and inclusion. The proposed motion would also
seek to increase communication among faculty, as many hiring processes are often structured in ways that are closed off. Major decisions should include feedback from faculty, and each proposed change would strengthen and increase communication among faculty. The proposed changes outlined in this motion will be discussed at the Nominations, Credentials, and Rules committee, and will be brought back to the floor for readings, discussion, and hopefully soon, a vote.

Motion to Amend Bylaws and Constitution of the Faculty Senate
Presented by Aaron Schneider to the Nominations, Credentials, and Rules Committee and the Full Faculty Senate

Current Bylaws III. A. 5. To provide to the administration, after consultation with the Executive Committee, the names of faculty members to be appointed to certain University committees, as provided in IV.A.4 of the Constitution. The President may ask the Nominating, Credentials and Rules Committee to assist in identifying candidates.

Proposed Bylaws III.A.5: To provide to the administration, after consultation with the Executive Committee and with the advice of the full senate, the names of faculty members to be appointed to all University committees in which faculty have a legitimate interest. The President will ask the Nominating, Credentials and Rules Committee, and other relevant faculty agencies such as the AAUP, to assist in selecting candidates for these committees.

Current Constitution III.C: C. Executive Committee. The President; President-elect; Past-President; Secretary; Chair of the Financial Planning Committee; Chairs of the Academic Planning Committee, Nominations, Credentials and Rules Committee, Personnel Committee, Student Relations Committee; two Senators elected as Members-at-large; and the editor of the Faculty Forum shall constitute the Executive Committee of the Senate. Following the election of its members at the close of the spring quarter, the newly-constituted Executive Committee shall examine its membership to ascertain whether all major University constituencies are represented. If not, it may appoint one additional Senator as member-at-large for a one-year term.

Proposed Constitution III. C. Executive Committee. The President; President-elect; Past-President; Secretary; Chair of the Financial Planning Committee; Chairs of the Academic Planning Committee, Nominations, Credentials and Rules Committee, Personnel Committee, Student Relations Committee; two Senators elected as Members-at-large; and the editor of the Faculty Forum, and an ex officio representative from any other relevant faculty body such as the AAUP, shall constitute the Executive Committee of the Senate. Following the election of its members at the close of the spring quarter, the newly-constituted Executive Committee shall examine its membership to ascertain whether all major University constituencies are represented. If not, it may appoint one additional Senator as member-at-large for a one-year term.
*Current Constitution* IV. A. 4: Appoint to University committees. To designate between one-quarter and one-half of the members (fraction to be determined in consultation with the Provost) of any all-University committee which deals with formulating policies or plans, recruiting key personnel, or like matters; and to receive interim, preliminary and final reports from such committees, so that standing Senate committees can contribute suggestions to their deliberations.

*Proposed Constitution* IV. A. 4: Appoint to University committees. To select, in consultation with relevant faculty agencies such as the AAUP, the members of any all-University committee which deals with formulating policies or plans, recruiting key personnel, or like matters; and to receive interim, preliminary and final reports from such committees, so that standing Senate committees can contribute suggestions to their deliberations. The fraction of faculty composition of all-university committees is to be determined in consultation with the Provost and should reflect the extent of legitimate faculty interest in the committee’s work (typically between one-quarter and one-half of the members). On issues with significant collective consequences, such as appointments of provosts or other senior academic administrators, faculty members on search committees should consult periodically with colleagues whom they represent by keeping them informed of discussion and soliciting their views.

*Current Constitution* V. B. 1: The Executive Committee is constituted as in III.C. Its functions shall be to represent the Senate when the Senate is not in session, to coordinate the work of the other standing committees, to conduct long-range planning for the Senate, and to prepare the agenda for meetings of the full Senate. The Executive Committee shall meet at least once per quarter with the Chancellor, with the Provost (see V.B.2) and with the Vice-Chancellor for Business and Financial Affairs (see V.B.3).

*Proposed Constitution* V. B. 1: The Executive Committee is constituted as in III.C. Its functions shall be to represent the Senate when the Senate is not in session, to coordinate the work of the other standing committees, to conduct long-range planning for the Senate, and to prepare the agenda for meetings of the full Senate. The Executive Committee shall meet at least once per quarter with the Chancellor, with the Provost (see V.B.2) and with the Vice-Chancellor for Business and Financial Affairs (see V.B.3). The Executive Committee shall consult and seek input from the full Senate and other faculty agencies such as the AAUP on any matter of great consequence to the faculty that comes up between Senate meetings.

Kate Willink: This motion will now go to NCR and they will review and discuss this. If you want to provide feedback, talk to NCR and Aaron. It goes to the Executive Committee. (response to question from the floor): We have never killed a motion – we may not agree with it, but we would not kill it, it would still be brought forward.

The Faculty Senate’s next meeting will be in Craig Hall, which will be our final meeting of the year. The meeting was adjourned at 1:30.