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Approved
Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate
February 4, 2011; 9 a.m.
St. Mary’s Hall Room 113B

Present: Judith Huacuja, Andrea Seielstad, Heidi Gauder, Corinne Daprano, Leno Pedrotti, Rebecca Wells, George Doyle, James Farrelly, Antonio Mari, Carolyn Roecker Phelps, Katie Trempe

Absent: Paul Benson, Joseph Saliba

Guests: None

Opening Meditation: Heidi Gauder opened the meeting with a meditation.

Minutes: The minutes of the January 28, 2011 meeting were approved

Announcements:
ECAS will review the agenda of the February 18, 2011 Academic Senate meeting at the February 11, 2011 ECAS meeting.

Old Business:
Review Senate Voting Rights Proposal. J. Huacuja indicated that the Senate Voting Rights Document is now numbered DOC I-11-01.

J. Huacuja reviewed proposed changes to the SACVI proposal recommended by L. Pedrotti. Several issues arose as the proposed changes were being discussed. One issue is that extending voting rights to the Dean of Libraries would increase the number and percent of representatives for the library relative to the small size of the library faculty. J. Farrelly suggested this may be a concern to faculty members in other units and that it may make sense to reconsider the issue of proportionality regarding representation to the Academic Senate. The suggested changes to the SACVI proposal made by L. Pedrotti were approved (10 for; 1 abstain).

The minutes of the November 22, 2010 ECAS meeting were consulted to review what course of action ECAS had agreed to pursue regarding both components (4.1 Concerning the Associate Provost & Dean of GPCE and 4.2 Concerning the Dean of University Libraries) of the SACVI proposal. It was determined that ECAS agreed to present both components to the Academic Senate and not to offer them as separate proposals. If approved by the Academic Senate the proposal would be put to a faculty vote.

Additional discussion regarding the linking of the two components ensued. Some members of ECAS expressed concern that faculty may vote against item 4.1 Concerning the Associate Provost & Dean of GPCE because they might object to granting voting rights to an Associate Provost. A concern was raised that this would then result in having to revert back to the existing language in the Senate constitution which could potentially disenfranchise the Dean of GPCE. However, after further discussion it was concluded that this would not occur.
J. Huacuja suggested and all agreed that component 6.0 Further Recommendations be moved and renumbered as 4.4 Further Recommendations.

A motion was made to present, for a faculty vote, both components (4.1 Concerning the Associate Provost & Dean of GPCE and 4.2 Concerning the Dean of University Libraries) in one Senate document but vote on them separately (G. Doyle – motion; R. Wells – second).

It was then suggested that the order of the two components be switched so that 4.1 would become 4.2 Concerning the Associate Provost & Dean of GPCE and similarly 4.2 would become 4.1 Concerning the Dean of University Libraries. Additionally, 4.3 Summary of Proposed Changes to the Constitution would not need to be voted on and could simply be incorporated into the constitution pursuant to passage of 4.1 and 4.2. A motion was made to switch the order of 4.1 and 4.2 (J. Huacuja – motion; G. Doyle – second). Motion approved unanimously.

A motion was then made to present one document with two separate distinct votes to the Academic Senate (4.1 as one vote and 4.2 as another vote) (J. Huacuja – motion; G. Doyle – second). The motion was approved (7 for; 3 against).

After this vote was taken ECAS members discussed 4.4 Further Recommendations, in particular, the language in 4.4 regarding the addition of student representation to the Academic Senate. Some questioned whether or not the discussion of additional student representatives should be initiated by ECAS (as proposed in 4.4) or instead by SGA. It was agreed that SGA should initiate a discussion with their constituents regarding additional student representation to the Academic Senate. A proposal made by SGA to add student representatives to the Academic Senate would then need to be put to a faculty vote.

On a final note, ECAS members agreed that 4.3 Summary of Proposed Changes to the Constitution and 4.4 Further Recommendations would not be numbered in Senate Document 11-01 when presented for a vote at the Academic Senate meeting on February 18, 2011. Instead these components will be included in the document as rationale.

J. Huacuja stressed the importance of communicating the SACVI proposal to the faculty through faculty forums and encouraging faculty to vote on the proposal when it is put forward. H. Gauder agreed to secure rooms for the faculty forums.

New Business:
Senate Representation on Human Resources Advisory Board. This item was tabled for the next ECAS meeting. R. Wells will contact Joyce Carter regarding Academic Senate representation on the HRA Board.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 AM.

Respectfully submitted by Corinne Daprano