

FACULTY SENATE CONSTITUTION AMENDED SPRING 2017

Results Report

TOTAL: 106 VOTES: 89 FOR
17-AGAINST

Votes: April 3, 2017 – May 1, 2017



Q1 - Please vote "for" or "against."

#	Answer	%	Count
1	For	83.96%	89
2	Against	16.04%	17
	Total	100.00%	106

COMMENTS

Q2 - If you have comments about the amended Spring 2017 Constitution, please use the box below to write your comments.

Answer	%	Count
Comments:	100.00%	10
Total	100%	10

1. Agenda should be provided more than one day in advance.

2. I don't think it makes sense to give the past-president a course release, when his/her only stated duty is to "assist the president as needed."

3. I am concerned that the current officer structure and terms is not working, as evidenced by fact appear to be having even more problems finding candidates than did before the change was made about 8 years (or more) ago to the current system. To be president means committing to three years of service - that is a long time. Would recommend we have a Secretary, Vice President, President-elect, and President with the Secretary and VP terms being 1 year, and President-elect and President terms being 1 yr each but with understanding that the combined commitment of service as President-elect and President is for total of two years. Having the Past President as an officer was an interesting concept but don't believe has worked that well in practice. Has the potential to become too involved in trying to protect from change those things instituted under that individual's administration. Plus by the point finish as President, potential is for the person to be really just tired and needing of a new direction/change.

2. The Credentials and Elections committee is getting too large with too much on its plate. If restore position of Vice President, have that person be chair of a nominating committee which is selected from the current Senate for the specific purpose of developing and presenting slate of candidates for Senate officers. Credentials and Elections can continue to manage staffing of committees. 3. Senate Executive Committee has the potential to develop talent for Senate Offices. Expand the number to four and mandate must be at least one from each academic college. Might need some special language to deal with University College issue - not sure exactly how it is classified. 4. There should be an eligibility requirement to serve on university policy committees - ideally should be tenured, but in the alternative should have been on faculty at UHD at least four or five years.

4. In the last paragraph of Article I Section 3, the use of "and/or" regarding lecturers and clinical faculty is unclear about whether they are considered equally or differentially when determining representation on the Faculty Senate. If a college has lecturers and clinical faculty, is there one seat for lecturers and one seat for clinical faculty? Or, are clinical faculty and lecturers running against one another for the one seat in the college? To me the intent is unclear as written.

5. Too much involvement of lecturers

6. You are proposing too many changes at once, and they are not exactly related. I would like to see each major change as a separate item for voting. I am against the idea of full professors voting on full professors. It creates an unbalanced representation as we do not have enough full professors. It also will lead to more biases and personal vendettas in questions related to promotion. Departmental politics is hard as is. Now you are adding an additional barrier for some to get promoted. It is very discouraging.

7. Why not add FAC and APC to the list of elections, as it is clear from policy that reps are elected via Senate processes? This would increase transparency.

8. I do not like the amendment making junior faculty wait until their 4th year to serve on the faculty senate. Service on the senate helps junior faculty fulfill their service obligations towards rank and tenure. As there is only one position per department, many deserving junior faculty will miss the opportunity to serve on the senate prior to their final tenure review.

9. I disagree that the meeting agenda only need to be sent out the day before the meeting.

10. Description of when one can be nominated for the faculty senate is not very clear.